

5494. Also, letter received from the Railroad Workers' Protective League of Western New York, favoring the enactment of the Boren land-grant bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5495. Also, resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, voicing their views in connection with House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5496. Also, resolution adopted by the Common Motor Carriers of Western New York, Inc., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5497. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, North Side, Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 98 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5498. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Herbert E. Cook and 87 other citizens of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2032); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5499. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Nellie Peterson and 50 other citizens of Moline, Ill., regarding prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war in order to reduce absenteeism and conserve manpower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5500. By Mr. MARCANTONIO: Petition of more than 4,000 registered voters of the Borough of Manhattan in the city of New York, protesting against enactment of any prohibition laws as encouraging bootlegging and harming the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5501. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted by executive committee of the New Hampshire Bankers Association, Manchester, N. H., opposing the passage of Senate bill 1642 and House bill 3956 and supporting the position taken by the Federal Reserve Board in connection with the issues raised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5502. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Pacific Coast Transportation Advisory Board of San Francisco regarding induction of essential railroad personnel into the armed forces, adopted March 16, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God who art behind the enshrouding mists and in them, we turn to Thee in whom there is no darkness at all. Through the mystery of earth's shadows lead our pilgrim feet as day by day we follow the gleam of Thy unfolding will for our lives, knowing that we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy love and care. In patience and fidelity may we guard the flickering flame of the light within. Grant by Thy grace that in our particular sphere of service we may not be found wanting in this solemn hour of world crisis, when the bugles are sounding and the battle is set.

We pray, as increasing trials come upon us, we may not shirk the issues of these creative days, nor lose our victorious faith in the final overthrow of evil and the enthronement of righteousness and truth, but, solemnly committing ourselves and our country unto Thee, who knoweth the way we take, that we shall come forth like gold tried in the fire. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 17, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905;

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters;

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay;

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act;

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument;

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey;

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed;

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4238. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service.

INVITATION FROM SENATE OF NORTHERN IRELAND TO MAKE VISIT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States; together with a letter of invitation from

the Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland, which were read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., April 14, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have been asked by the Foreign Office to transmit to you the enclosed letter.

Believe me, dear Mr. Vice President,

Yours very sincerely,

HALIFAX.

The Honourable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Senate Office.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE

VISCOUNT BANGOR, O. B. E.,

Stormont, Belfast, March 21, 1944.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am directed by the Senators of Northern Ireland to extend to the delegation from the Senate of the United States, which, it is understood, may visit Great Britain in the near future, a very cordial invitation to spend some days with them as their guests in Northern Ireland.

Senators are very anxious to cement the excellent relations which have existed between the forces of the United States and the people of this country during the war, and to promote a closer association between this Parliament and Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

BANGOR.

Speaker of the Senate of Northern Ireland.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Washington, D. C.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS UNDER NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the Railway Labor Panel, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL WAR HOUSING—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on December 18, 1943, I introduced S. 1607, a bill "to provide for the disposition of Federal War Housing." At the time of the introduction of the bill I had discussed this measure with a member of the National Committee on Housing, and was under the impression that the bill had the support of that committee. I have since learned that, while the bill reflects in substance proposals which that organization has made and published, proposals which have had wide approval, the committee seems to believe that most of its recommendations can be accomplished under existing laws.

I also received, on January 13, 1944, a letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, a paragraph of which reads:

In summary, we feel that, through the process of experience over the past few years, and through the splendid cooperation of the

Congress in shaping the Lanham Act to meet our needs as they have arisen and as the Congress and the Agency have foreseen them, we now have practically all of the necessary legislative tools to deal effectively and efficiently with the disposition of federally owned war housing.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1607, and that the bill may be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 86. An act to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 28, 1905; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1565. An act relating to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 1675. An act to amend section 9 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2752. An act to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4163. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3524. An act to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3054. An act to amend the Expediting Act; and

H. R. 3732. An act to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4238. An act providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4115. An act to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed;

H. R. 4292. An act to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4320. An act relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PRELUDE TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prelude to Peace," delivered by him at the seventy-fourth anniversary banquet celebration of Perry Lodge, F. & A. M., Marys-

ville, Pa., March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Edwin Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, before the State Federation of Labor, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., April 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECEIPTS BY FARMERS UNDER 1942 AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter and tables from the Department of Agriculture relative to estimated gross payments under the 1942 agricultural conservation program, which appear in the Appendix.]

IRAQ'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Iraq's Contribution to the Common War Effort of the United Nations," compiled from Iraq Government official sources by Maj. Chefik Haddad, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. ALBANS MESSENGER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the St. Albans Messenger for April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] presented for the RECORD an article from a Detroit newspaper showing that milk was flowing in the gutters in Detroit.

On April 15, I wrote the War Food Administration an inquiry, and received in reply a letter dated April 15, 1944, a part of which I wish to read:

The increasingly critical milk production situation, the increased urgency in volume of military and lend-lease needs for dairy products, and the continued increase in civilian consumption of fluid milk in this country made it necessary last fall that we either take some type of action to limit any further increase in civilian sales of fluid milk, or that we default in our job of meeting dairy products requirements for direct war uses.

Mr. President, this morning there came to my desk a telegram stating that milk prices have been cut 10 cents a hundredweight in Wisconsin, effective March 16, but it was not announced to the farmers until the checks were delivered on April 17.

Just think of that. On April 17 the farmers who went to the extraordinary effort asked of them, farmers whose boys have been taken from the farms, these farmers who had, through the winter, with the aid of the youngsters and the oldesters, met the demands of the Government for a super supply of milk, now find that the checks for their milk, which were due on March 15, have been cut to the extent of 10 cents a hundredweight.

The telegram states:

I ask that you protest price cut to O. P. A. and War Food Administration.

I agree with what is implied in this message, that the cutting of prices to ex-

tend back a month before the farmers have notice is not only unethical, but it is contributing to a demoralization of the home front right now, when we need morale as we never needed it before.

I wish to speak briefly about the situation as it exists in Wisconsin, and as I know it exists in other States throughout this country. Right now we can divide the proposition into three parts. First, what is the situation in relation to the transportation facilities in Wisconsin and other States? That goes to the question of trucks. The situation in Wisconsin, as it relates to farmers' milk trucks, and all milk transporting trucks, is becoming tragic. The Government asked that the farmer produce, and produce and produce, and he has done it. Then the Government reached in and took the farmers' help, and kept on taking his help, and it is taking his help now.

There will soon fall on the transportation facilities of the milk industry one of the most tremendous loads in the history of our State. This increased burden is being piled on a transportation system which is rapidly breaking down beyond economical repair. It is getting to the point where farmers cannot take their trucks in and get them overhauled. The trucks need new motors, but the farmers cannot get new motors. The chassis are going to pieces, even beyond repair. New trucks are what the farmers need and what the milk industry needs.

If the Government has surplus trucks available, it must see to it that the milk industry obtains them in order that milk may be transported. As I have said, already milk is flowing in the gutters of Detroit. I shall mention an incident which was related to me by a professor at the University of Wisconsin, indicating how serious is the situation at another part of this front. The Government is asking for more milk, more farm commodities, and it owes an obligation to make sure that those commodities get to the market and to the consumer. Someone must take hold of the situation at once.

I have received a letter from Mr. R. K. Froker, professor of agricultural economics, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, at Madison, Wis., with which he sent to me two tables indicating, first, the balance of the life of the trucks used to haul milk in seven Wisconsin counties, and, second, the total mileage on trucks used in hauling milk in seven Wisconsin counties. In his letter to me, Professor Froker says, among other things:

Only a very open and mild winter has prevented a general breakdown in our milk-truck assembling system in the State. We have heard many complaints of the difficulties our dairy plants are now having in keeping their trucks operating. Practically no new milk trucks have been added since the fall of 1941. Approximately one-half of our milk trucks would have been replaced by new ones had normal supplies of trucks been available. Moreover, our present trucks are much more heavily loaded due to fewer trucks and increased milk production. To add to this situation is the general difficulty of obtaining adequate repair parts and finding capable mechanics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the two tables from Professor Froker be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 15, 1944.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your wire asking for a copy of our transportation study on trucking conditions in Wisconsin as it applies to the milk industry. The material which we have published has dealt largely with possibilities of conserving mileage through the reorganization of milk truck routes. The other phases of the study have not been published to date.

I am, however, enclosing a copy of two tables which I believe will show you the general condition of our milk trucks in Wisconsin. You will note that the truck situation is becoming progressively more serious. Only a very open and mild winter has prevented a general break-down in our milk-truck assembling system in the State.

We have heard many complaints of the difficulties our dairy plants are now having in keeping their trucks operating. Practically no new milk trucks have been added since

the fall of 1941. Approximately one-half of our milk trucks would have been replaced by new ones had normal supplies of trucks been available. Moreover, our present trucks are much more heavily loaded due to fewer trucks and increased milk production. To add to this situation is the general difficulty of obtaining adequate repair parts and finding capable mechanics.

Very truly yours,

R. K. FROKER,
Professor of Agricultural Economics.

Estimated life of trucks used for hauling milk in 7 Wisconsin counties, August 1943¹

| | On basis of present service and ability to get repairs | | If adequate service and repairs are provided | |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | Number of trucks | Percent of those reporting | Number of trucks | Percent of those reporting |
| 6 months and under..... | 92 | 17.0 | 24 | 4.5 |
| 7 to 12..... | 169 | 31.3 | 83 | 15.5 |
| 13 to 18..... | 43 | 8.0 | 36 | 6.7 |
| 19 to 24..... | 142 | 26.3 | 163 | 30.5 |
| 25 to 30..... | 14 | 2.6 | 38 | 7.1 |
| 31 and over..... | 80 | 14.8 | 190 | 35.7 |
| Total..... | 540 | 100.0 | 534 | 100.0 |
| Not reporting..... | 113 | | 119 | |

¹ Compiled by Clifford M. Hardin and Rudolph K. Froker, department of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin.

Total mileage on trucks used for hauling milk in 7 Wisconsin counties, August 1943¹

| Total mileage | All models ² | Percent of all trucks reporting | Model of truck | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|----|
| | | | 1942 | 1941 | 1940 | 1939 | 1938 | 1937 | 1936 | 1935 | 1934 and older | |
| Under 50,000..... | 234 | 40.2 | 50 | 91 | 52 | 19 | 6 | 9 | | | | 4 |
| 50,000 to 74,999..... | 167 | 28.7 | 3 | 47 | 47 | 28 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 3 | | 2 |
| 75,000 to 99,999..... | 86 | 14.8 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 3 | | 4 |
| 100,000 to 124,999..... | 52 | 9.0 | | 3 | 16 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | | 3 |
| 125,000 to 149,999..... | 14 | 2.4 | | | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | 1 |
| 150,000 to 174,999..... | 16 | 2.8 | | | 6 | 4 | | 2 | 3 | | | 1 |
| 175,000 to 199,999..... | 5 | .9 | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 2 | | |
| 200,000 to 224,999..... | 6 | 1.0 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | |
| 225,000 and over..... | 1 | .2 | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Total..... | 581 | 100.0 | 56 | 153 | 152 | 80 | 40 | 45 | 26 | 14 | | 15 |

Compiled by Clifford M. Hardin and Rudolph K. Froker, department of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin.

² 72 trucks did not report this figure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been in contact with Brig. Gen. C. D. Young, Deputy Director, Office of Defense Transportation, who has agreed to collaborate in trying to find the solution to this problem. There have been many things which have contributed to the scarcity of trucks available for the home front. The completion of one of the oil pipe lines was delayed, but that is now completed. The delay meant using certain tank trucks to meet the critical oil situation. The flush milk season will soon be on in Wisconsin, and it is up to Government to see that the transportation system for much-needed foodstuffs, such as milk and other farm commodities, does not break down.

Mr. President, the administrative branch of the Government is not doing the job it should do. The Congress created the various bureaus and agencies. They are stepchildren of Congress. When they fall down on the job it is for Congress to see to it that they get back on the job and do what should be done.

Mr. President, now I wish to discuss the subject of manpower as it relates to

the cheese factories, and also to discuss the related subject of milk. I hold in my hand a letter from W. W. Clark, associate director of the agricultural extension service, University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture, at Madison, Wis. I wish to read certain paragraphs of his letter, which is dated April 14, 1944. I realize that this matter does not seem of great significance, perhaps, to those who listen or to those who are not listening, but if the vast food laboratory called the State of Wisconsin, which produces this year between 60 and 65 percent of the Nation's cheese, breaks down, the situation will be very serious. When we realize that the Army and the Navy are taking 75 percent of our cheese for Army and Navy and lend-lease use, it must appear to any reasonable person that it is a serious situation to permit a paralysis of a great industry like the milk, cheese, and butter industry. That is what is likely to happen if we do not obtain the needed trucks, or, second, if we do not keep in our cheese factories the men who know how to produce cheese, and if the farmers do not receive differ-

ent treatment relative to the price of milk.

I read from Mr. Clark's letter:

You have no doubt already had your attention called to the very serious situation which faces the Wisconsin cheese industry through the operation of the recent policy of National Selective Service headquarters in drafting all men between the ages of 18 and 26 for military service, with certain exceptions. My purpose in addressing you is to provide information on this situation which you may not have conveniently available and which you may find helpful in considering the problem.

Listen to this, Mr. President. Mr. Clark then says:

Much of the following information has already been transmitted to General Hershey by Col. John F. Mullen, State director of Wisconsin selective service, but up to the present time no relief has been provided.

Let me interject parenthetically that I have been in contact with General Hershey's office now for over a week or 10 days. He passes the buck back to Marvin Jones. When I get in contact with Jones, he passes the buck to Hershey. In the meantime, cheese factories in the State of Wisconsin are closing, and the milk we need will be running down the gutters. How much longer will this situation continue?

General Hershey apparently feels that there should be no deferment of men 26 years of age unless he receives some kind of directive or recommendation. I have called his attention to the serious nature of the situation existing in the State of Wisconsin. I have told him that there are in the neighborhood of 1,623 cheese factories in the State, and that 150 of them are 1-man cheese factories. But the other day, according to Mr. Clark's letter, when the Selective Service reached in and took 1 of those men, the farmers of Clark County got hold of 1 of the cheese inspectors and forcibly compelled him to enter that cheese factory and run it. The Army wants the cheese; the Navy wants the cheese; the Lend-Lease wants the cheese. Yet, they have not enough brains to understand the necessity of making sure that this 1 man remains on the job. He cannot be replaced. That is the situation.

Professor Clark says in his letter that 135 of these men are the sole operators of 1-man factories. Mr. Mooney, the secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association, wrote me a letter in which he said there are 150 men who are the sole operators of 1-man cheese factories. Yet, I have not been able to get any action.

Let us take a typical situation. Suppose 150 farmers in a certain area supply their milk to a cheese factory run by 1 cheese maker, and suppose that all at once the Selective Service takes that cheese maker into the armed services. A cheese maker cannot be trained overnight. He is a specialist. He has to know his business. The drafting of a cheese maker is quite different from the drafting of an ordinary farmer. The drafting of an ordinary farmer affects only 1 farm. I had such an experience, when a farm boy was taken off my farm. Of course, when he was drafted

the only effect was upon my farm; production on my farm subsequently decreased. But, Mr. President, when the Selective Service drafts a cheese maker out of a 1-man cheese factory which is the receiving source of the milk from 150 to 500 farms, then the Selective Service not only makes it impossible for the milk on those farms to be delivered to the cheese factory and for the cheese to be made from the milk, but the Selective Service lights a flame in the minds of those milk producers who have been working 70 and 80 hours a week; and God knows we cannot light any flames to break the morale in America. I say it simply does not make sense, and that is why I am talking here today.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter of Prof. W. W. Clark be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., April 14, 1944.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEAR SENATOR: You have no doubt already had your attention called to the very serious situation which faces the Wisconsin cheese industry through the operation of the recent policy of National Selective Service headquarters in drafting all men between the ages of 18 and 26 for military service, with certain exceptions. My purpose in addressing you is to provide information on this situation which you may not have conveniently available and which you may find helpful in considering the problem.

Much of the following information has already been transmitted to General Hershey by Col. John F. Mullen, State director of Wisconsin Selective Service, but up to the present time no relief has been provided. I am also furnishing Judge Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, with this information. My feeling is that this situation needs to be remedied, not because of the results which the drafting of young cheese makers would have on individuals, important as these may be, but because of the very serious effects which widespread drafting of young cheese makers will have upon the production of milk and cheese for the national war effort.

In the 1,623 cheese factories in Wisconsin there are 1,475 men 18 through 25 years of age. One hundred and thirty-five of these men are the sole operators of 1-man factories. Their drafting will close most of those factories. About 400 men, 18 through 25, are employed in 2-man factories and about 900 men of the same ages in larger factories.

This morning I was told of an operator in a one-man factory in Clark County who was ordered to take a preinduction physical examination. His absence for the day left absolutely no one in his community who could take care of the milk delivered to his factory. The report is that farmers located a State cheese inspector in another part of the county, surrounded him and insisted that he make the cheese for the day in their factory to prevent the loss of the milk.

About 75 percent of our cheese factories are located in sparsely settled rural communities. The established custom is to use cheese makers' sons and young, healthy and strong farm boys as trainees in the plants. Factories are unable to hire labor from urban

areas or from older age brackets due to the generally prevailing low-wage scale, the long work schedule (7 days and 70-80 hours a week), and the heavy physical labor involved. Women are not generally adapted to this work for the same reasons. (Cans of milk weigh around 115 pounds, Cheddar cheese around 75 pounds, and Swiss cheese drums 175 to 225 pounds.) Single men are generally employed because they can board and room with the cheese maker in the living quarters above the factory. Married men are not attracted to the industry as helpers because of the absence of living quarters for families and the inconvenience and difficulties of daily transportation from urban centers.

There are absolutely no replacements available for trained cheese makers included in this group and a considerable proportion of the experienced helpers cannot be replaced for the reasons stated above.

State selective-service headquarters estimates that of the nearly 1,500 young men now working in cheese factories, it is imperative that at least 550 be deferred to prevent loss of food and reduction in milk production. My own judgment is that unless an even larger number is deferred there will be serious difficulty in handling milk in the cheese areas through the flush season which is now coming on.

I am receiving reports from county agents and others in various parts of the State indicating material increases in the rate of milk production over the same period in 1943. For example, the county agent in Pepin County has collected figures showing that farmers in that locality are producing 11 percent more milk than they did at the same time a year ago. A condensery operator in Door County is receiving 12 percent more milk from fewer patrons than he had a year ago. The Badger Consolidated at Shawano reported 2 or 3 weeks ago that over the previous 30-day period they had received 6 percent more milk per patron than they did a year ago. Other less definite reports indicate that in many sections of the State there is a material increase in milk production. Professor Froker, of the college of agriculture, estimates that our plants are now handling 40 percent more whole milk than they did in 1939, of which about half is due to an increase in production of milk and the other half due to shifting from farm separated cream production to delivery of whole milk.

This situation is significant, because it means that milk which is now going to cheese factories could not be manufactured in other plants in this State during the coming flush period, even if it were desirable to do so. In fact, I have reports of condenseries which are unable to handle all the milk which they are getting now and are shipping part of their normal receipts of milk to other condenseries for processing. With the spring flush coming on, this situation will become more serious due both to the normal seasonal increase in milk and the removal by draft of young men from the other milk-processing plants.

I need not include to you a statement as to the importance of the Wisconsin milk industry in the national food program, but many other people, including, I presume, General Hershey, may not realize that Wisconsin produces one-eighth of all the milk in the United States and half of the Cheddar cheese produced in this country. Approximately one-half of all the cheese bought by the Government for the Army and lend-lease purposes comes from Wisconsin.

Of course, if nothing is done to retain these young cheese makers in their factories there will still be cheese made in Wisconsin, but the production of this type of food will be badly disrupted, and considerable

amounts of milk will spoil or will be fed to livestock. I sincerely hope the National Selective Service headquarters can be convinced that this situation should be handled with judgment and not find it out by experience when it is too late.

Respectfully yours,

W. W. CLARK,
Associate Director.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I read one paragraph of the letter:

I need not include to you a statement as to the importance of the Wisconsin milk industry in the national food program, but many other people including, I presume, General Hershey, may not realize that Wisconsin produces one-eighth of all the milk in the United States and half of the Cheddar cheese produced in this country. Approximately one-half of all the cheese bought by the Government for the Army and lend-lease purposes comes from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, we now come to the third subdivision of my remarks and that is the reduction in the price of milk. It has been clearly pointed out earlier in my remarks that the farmers have performed miracles in production. By working their children and their grandparents, and by every other means, they got the production that the Government wanted. Now, without any notice to them, their milk checks are reduced by 10 cents a hundred. That is fine encouragement. It is wonderful treatment by the Government. This is not keeping faith.

But the real issue is, What are we going to do about it? These bureaus, divisions, and other agencies are our foster children. They are accountable to us. We created them. I know how easy it is for the Senate to overlook things and pass the buck once we have created an agency and told someone to do a certain thing. "Let George do it."

Mr. President, I received a letter today from a businessman—a big businessman this time—who operates four or five factories in my State. He stated that if Congress did not do something, the people would get the impression that there was no further need for Congress. That is a pretty serious statement.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about milk. About a year ago, when the Office of Price Administration granted an increase in the selling price of case goods for evaporated milk, the newspapers carried the story that the O. P. A. based its finding of \$4.10 a case on a price to producers of \$2.46 for milk of 3.5 percent butterfat. Several persons in the industry have told me that the O. P. A. has given this same type of information to the evaporated-milk industry. The producer's price of \$2.46 a hundred was supposed to have been arrived at by taking the historical margin between the price of case goods and the amount paid to the producer. For example, if the case-goods price were \$4.10 a hundred, and the producers were being paid \$2.46, subtracting \$2.46 from \$4.10 would leave a remainder of \$1.64, which is supposed to be the historical margin on which the evaporated-milk industry operates. This does not reflect the margin which the O. P. A. is supposed to have today. The

O. P. A. claims to have used the historical margin of \$1.55 a hundred. In that case the producer's price would be \$2.63 a hundredweight, without respect to what the proper historical margin should be. The evaporated-milk producers claim—and I have been in contact with them—that the O. P. A. found the proper price to the producer to be \$2.46 a hundred. When the selling price of \$4.10 a case was established, the evaporated-milk industry was paying \$2.60 to the producers in Wisconsin. Therefore, under those circumstances, it can be seen how inappropriate it is at this time to take 10 cents from what the farmer has been receiving.

It appears to me that the subsidy payment has been used as a vehicle to permit the evaporated industry to gain 15 cents per hundredweight, for which they have been fighting for about a year. It is my further observation that the Government will reduce the feed subsidies effective the 1st of May. I have heard from some quarters that the reduction subsidy will be 20 cents per hundredweight. There are others who say it will be reduced as much as 30 cents per hundredweight. In the event the Government reduces the subsidy payment by 30 cents per hundredweight, effective May 1, the producer will be taking 45 cents per hundredweight less for his milk than he was during the first 15 days of March.

Historically, surpluses in the flush period from the small milk plants in Wisconsin are handled by the large evaporating companies. It has long been the policy of the evaporating people to pay these small plants a small premium over and above established producer prices. In recent years this premium has amounted to about 15 cents per hundredweight. This permits the small plants, cooperatives, and cheese factories to absorb the additional handling charges that are involved when they have to pay two hauling costs on the milk; one to get the milk to the plant, and another to get it to the factory plant. There are other small plant charges, such as cooling and reassembling for the evaporating plants.

When one realizes that the Pure Milk Products Cooperative (one Wisconsin milk group) produced 1,105,340,000 pounds of milk last year, and when one also realizes that the whole State of Maryland produced only 945,000,000 pounds, one can readily see how important it is to give to an area which can produce much of the needed milk consideration equal to that accorded a State such as Maryland, where high-cost production prevails. Wisconsin's total milk production will run 15,000,000,000 pounds per year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us an explanation as to why 10 cents a hundred was taken from the milk checks?

Mr. WILEY. I have no adequate explanation. I can assure the Senator that the farmers were in the dark until it bumped them in the eye. When they

received their checks, 10 cents a hundred was taken from them, just as though someone should reach into the Senator's pocket and take what belongs to him. I am saying that the Government should see to it that the farmers are better treated. The population of my State is about 3,100,000. The State is about 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural. We cannot treat a million and a half people like that and get by with it very long in the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Do the farmers receive their checks from the A. A. A. office in the State?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; through feed subsidy checks. The reduction came in the checks from the condenseries the Government furnished the vehicle. The farmers had no knowledge of what was going on. All at once it hit them.

Mr. President, within the past day or so the Army has announced its procurement needs with respect to evaporated milk. I understand that the Army is asking for 16,000,000 cases of evaporated milk to be delivered at the rate of 5,000,000 cases for May, 5,000,000 cases for June, three and a half million cases for July, and two and a half million cases for August. I believe that is almost double the amount heretofore required for the same period of time.

Last fall the Government said to the boys and girls and old folks, "Go out and produce; we will fix the price." The price was fixed. Now the Army wants double the amount it previously required, and the farmer gets it in the neck. His price is reduced 10 cents a hundred pounds. What is happening? His machinery is wearing out. He must work with fewer facilities, less manpower, and less capital; and now the price of his milk is reduced 10 cents a hundred. As I have stated, I believe that the amount requested is double the amount of milk heretofore required for the same period of time. Five million cases of milk a month is just about the capacity of the evaporated-milk industry. With such a tremendous increase in demand, it does not seem possible that there should be such a reduction in the price as has been made.

I am advised that in Maryland and Virginia the producers have had a base price of \$4 a hundred, with a feed subsidy of 80 cents a hundred, and a subsidy of \$13.50 a ton on hay. The total subsidy on hay alone is about \$2,000,000. There is a feed subsidy of 80 cents a hundred, to say nothing about the hay subsidy paid to the producers of Virginia and Maryland. The price of milk to the producers in Wisconsin was reduced on March 15 by 10 cents a hundred. That is enough to discourage further production.

On the other hand, as I have already stated, Wisconsin supplies one-third of the evaporated milk needs of the Nation, and the farmers get it in the neck. It is only natural to assume that there is a greater potential possibility of increasing production in Wisconsin than in any other State. We have the factories, the cows, and the means of manufacturing dairy products. If subsidies are to be paid as an incentive to increase milk

production in Wisconsin, Wisconsin should be recognized for its ability to supply the milk. An increase in milk production should be brought about by a substantial increase in incentive payments.

Mr. President, perhaps I have talked long enough. The record is here. If the Government does not move, I fear a situation which may be truly tragic. If 700 cheesemakers are taken away from Wisconsin, the result will be not only a reduction in production, but also a direct loss in foodstuffs. Milk flows to the cheese factories just as water flows through the faucets in a house. If cheese factories are shut down, we can imagine what will happen.

But that is not all. We can ruin the economic life of a State by such practices. In addition, we can do what is suggested by the businessman who wrote to me. He operates five factories. We can so sabotage the mentality of our people that they will say, "There is no further need of a legislative body."

I wonder if someone is planning it that way. I wonder if someone is thinking that course through. I wonder if back of all this there is not only misdirection and lack of action, but an absolute feeling that the day of legislative power is over. We can so crucify the people by failing them in their economic needs that they may take steps which they would not take in more sober moments. Only a few years ago the farmers were battling with pitchforks and guns. Why did they do it? They did it for the same reason that actuated men during the American Revolution. They did it to protect their homes and their economic life blood. They did it to sustain their families. Now the Government tells farmers to produce milk, cheese, and butter, and at the same time takes away from them their help. It allows them inadequate facilities with which to transport their produce, and it wrecks initiative by cutting down, without justification or equity, the compensation that they should receive.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I lay this subject in the lap of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce having in charge the rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 3961, I wish to give notice that hearings on the bill will begin before the subcommittee on Tuesday, April 25. I have charge of the naval appropriation bill, and hope to get through with that bill Friday of this week, and then I should like to take up the rivers and harbors bill immediately afterward, because after that will come the flood-control bill, which we hope will be sent over to the Senate from the House by the time we conclude consideration of the rivers and harbors bill. Following that will be the bill relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I advised the Senator yesterday, with a group of Senators from various States, Governors of Western States are very much interested in making a presentation to the subcommittee of which the Senator from Louisiana is chairman with respect to the rivers and harbors bill. These Governors are coming East for the Governors' Conference on May 28, and it was hoped that opportunity might be provided for them at that time to make their opinions known to the subcommittee.

We agreed yesterday to make an effort to see whether or not the western Governors could come at an earlier date. I will say to the Senator that in spite of my efforts I have not yet received any definite answer. But I want to make the record clear that it is our desire to make certain that the points of view to be presented by these Governors may be presented to the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say that I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators as far as I possibly can. There will be a number of controversial items in the rivers and harbors bill, the hearings on which will occupy some appreciable time—I do not know how long—but when we start the hearings I should like to go through with them, and I should like the cooperation of the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators from the Western States who are interested in the bill, to aid me in expediting the hearings.

I assume the Governors, a number of whom are coming, can be here before the conference begins. They cannot all testify on the same day. Then there will be other witnesses who can be heard on the subject matter in which the Senator from Wyoming is interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Every effort will be made to bring these Governors here as long in advance of the conference as possible.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I heard the Senator from Louisiana make some reference to proposed legislation with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway. Just what is that legislation, and is the Senator making any request to present it at this time?

Mr. OVERTON. No. I said that following the rivers and harbors bill there will be the flood-control bill. I happen to have the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee dealing with those measures. I am also the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WHITE. I merely desire to make certain that no unanimous-consent agreement is entered into with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway until we have a chance to see what it is.

Mr. OVERTON. No; there is no such request whatsoever. I simply stated that certain measures were in futuro, and that the measures were coming up for consideration in the ordinary course of events, in the sequence I mentioned.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Can the Senator indicate what might be the earliest or the latest time when it would be convenient for the committee for these western Governors to be heard?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very glad to hear them at anytime following Tuesday, April 25, just as soon as they can be here. But if additional time is required, I am sure there are going to be other controversial features of the bill which will require some testimony, and we can take up those features first. I shall be very glad to cooperate along that line. I cannot say how long it will take to consider those features.

Mr. NYE. The Senator cannot determine now how long hearings on the other matters might require?

Mr. OVERTON. No; that is correct.

Mr. NYE. Might it be as much as 10 days?

Mr. OVERTON. Possibly so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that if it should be determined that the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill should be delayed in order to permit the western Governors to make their appearance and give their testimony in the latter part of May, then the proponents of the seaway bill, as they have advised me, would be prepared to give their testimony by the 1st of May. Included among the witnesses would be some Governors from the Eastern States. If it should be found advisable to postpone the rivers and harbors hearings until the latter part of May, I am sure the advocates of the seaway would be glad to make good use of the intervening time in presenting their case before the committee, as they are already prepared to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont, but I will say that there is no intention to delay the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill. I simply stated that the hearings will begin on Tuesday, April 25, and then we shall proceed as expeditiously as possible. It is my intention to take up the flood-control bill thereafter.

Mr. AIKEN. But, Mr. President, it occurred to me that if the rivers and harbors bill should be considered before the St. Lawrence seaway bill, and if the hearings on the rivers and harbors bill do not begin until the last of May—

Mr. OVERTON. They are to begin on Tuesday, April 25.

Mr. AIKEN. The hearings will begin on that day?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood one of my colleagues to say that the Governors could not appear before the last of May.

Mr. OVERTON. They are going to attend a Governors' conference toward the last of May, but they are also going to be present at these hearings before May 25 or 28, or whatever time the conference is to be held.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally I hope the hearings on all these bills may be held as soon as possible.

Mr. OVERTON. I think we ought to get through with the rivers and harbors bill sometime in the middle of May.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, the Senator will get to the controversial features of the bill first. Does the Senator anticipate that the navigation features of the bill relating to the Missouri River will come up, say, prior to a week or 10 days hence? My reason for pressing the question is that we have some technical men who are working on those features.

Mr. OVERTON. Well, making a guess, I should think that probably the Missouri River project, if it is to be taken up last, will not come up until 10 days after April 25, the day when the hearings are to begin.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire of the Senator whether the big Missouri River project, the billion-dollar project, is in the rivers and harbors bill, or the flood-control bill? My understanding is that it is in the flood-control bill, which is to come up later.

Mr. OVERTON. The project for deepening the channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River is in the pending rivers and harbors bill, and that is the project to which the Senators from the West are referring.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The rivers and harbors bill, concerning which the Senator from Louisiana has been speaking, includes, as I understand, a great many other projects besides those which have just been mentioned by various Senators who have spoken.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. BURTON. I particularly wish to say that I hope the bill includes a project at Youngstown, Ohio. I appreciate the action taken by the Senator from Louisiana with respect to providing early hearings on the bill, which involves not only this matter, but also involves a great many other matters which it will take much time to consider. I hope we can quickly proceed with hearings on the various items contained in the bill, and reach a conclusion with respect to them in the early part of the spring.

I appreciate very much the Senator from Louisiana having given notice of the hearings, and wished to mention the project at Youngstown, Ohio, which comes before the Senate as a new matter. It is not contained in the House bill.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. OVERTON. I may say that a great many requests have come to me to proceed with the hearings as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to express my appreciation of the fact that immediate consideration is to be given to this very important project. It is necessary that consideration be given almost immediately to the situation in the Carolinas along the Atlantic Ocean. I again wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana for expediting the hearings on this important matter.

Mr. OVERTON. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that there is one project in his State which is of supreme importance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; the project in Charleston, S. C.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, April 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of life and spirit of truth, we bless Thee that in all sublime creation there is the working of the divine purpose, a power other than ourselves. Not by our own might can we attain the highest levels, but through Thy spirit these may be glorified. Lay Thy hand upon us that our neglected gifts may be revived; make clean our hearts within us and take not Thy holy spirit from us.

Have mercy upon this old world with its hard face and stone walls. O lift the mirror of truth and show America her real self, her easy faith, the pathos of spiritual declension, the slacking of her zeal in holy worship. Inspire in her breast a more sincere spirit, a consecrated soul rich in emotion and intensity. By the historic standards of eternal principles, may we test afresh our actions and forever dissipate the dream of easy tasks and the nightmare of failure. Stay by, O God, when hostilities arrest our hopes and our cause seems ready to fail. O keep us silently, steadily, and persistently at our work, knowing that soon there will be a glow in the sky of freedom's horizon. In the name of our mediator, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE McKELLAR AMENDMENTS TO THE T. V. A.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLANNAGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSE AND SENATE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SATTERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Miles F. Hollister, of Altoona, Pa., before a number of service clubs and civic organizations throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the West Frankfort Chamber of Commerce, West Frankfort, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TYPICAL AMERICAN MARINE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in this Hall, so representative of the variety that is America, I believe that we should pause in reverence to the memory of the typical American marine.

His name was Fernand G. Bernard, of Lawrence, Mass. "Pete" they called him. This kid who won his letter in football at high school, who became a mill worker in a mill city, a church-going youth who liked to tinker with the family car, to swim at Forest Lake, to take his best girl to the movies on the traditional Wednesday night date. You see, there was nothing exceptional in his background except that he was an average American boy.

Perhaps, with an intuition greater than understanding, he sensed the danger to the people he loved, long before the rest of us did, and he resolved to do something about it.

The biggest challenge to his young life was coming up and he did not want to sit on the side lines.

In May of 1941 he enlisted with the finest body of fighting men, the United

States Marine Corps. He trained at Parris Island. It was then that he was selected by a national magazine in a seven-page photo-history as the typical American marine.

He became a member of the Marine Raiders and for 13 months was overseas. On March 8, 1944, somewhere in the South Pacific theater, Sgt. Fernand G. Bernard was killed in action.

Lawrence, Mass., grieves her loss, yet stemming from this sacrifice comes the consciousness, with this heritage, which he passed on to us, of the great responsibilities we must meet and match as typical Americans.

AMENDMENT TO USE TAX STAMP ACT

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FLIGHT OF THE "CONSTELLATION" FROM CALIFORNIA TO WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a giant air transport, the new Lockheed *Constellation*, flew from Lockheed Airport in Burbank, Calif., to Washington in 6 hours and 56 minutes, thus beating the fastest speed record made heretofore by nearly a half-hour and the fastest coast-to-coast transport record by more than 3 hours. I hope the Members of the House will join with me as the Representative of the Twentieth District of California in taking pride in that aircraft which was designed and built in my district. It was conceived on the drafting board more than 4 years ago. That is notice to the House that you do not turn out a wonderful airplane in a day; however, we now have that aircraft and can produce many more just like it for the service of our country. It presents a preview of what we may expect in civil air transport after the war is over.

This giant transport was conceived by Jack Frye and Howard Hughes, of T. W. A. It was designed and built by Lockheed Aircraft Corporation for T. W. A. and Pan-American Airways, but war intervened and the contracts were taken over by the Army Air Force.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and to include therein three short resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address given on April 13 on the Town Meeting of the Air program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and to include a letter that the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, wrote the Commerce Committee of the Senate in connection with that project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk today, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

THE FLIGHT OF THE "CONSTELLATION" FROM CALIFORNIA TO WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1937 a hard-working young man endowed with much initiative and creative ability designed and had built a worthy service airplane in Los Angeles, Calif., and flew it to New York in 7 hours and 29 minutes. No other man has been able to equal that record to date.

Five weeks ago today I visited the Lockheed factory located at Burbank, Calif., with this same forward looking and patriotic gentleman, Howard Hughes. We went through and inspected and observed the *Constellation*, the big plane designed by Mr. Hughes that landed at the National Airport yesterday after a flight of only 6 hours and 56 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this huge transport is the largest land plane ever built. Mr. Hughes built it over the same design that he used in building his small plane in 1937. Another remarkable trait of this philanthropist is that he not only flew around the world in the shortest time,

but piloted this big plane with Co-Pilot Jack Frye, on its history-making trip yesterday. I am sure you join with me in congratulating not only Mr. Hughes and Mr. Frye, but the management and labor force that built this giant of the air.

In less than a year we will witness Mr. Hughes and Mr. Frye flying an air giant three or four times the size of the *Constellation* from California to the Washington Airport in less than 6 hours and 56 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, portending what is to come in the future air world, I received an air-mail letter last night which was placed in my box at the hotel at 6 o'clock that was mailed in Los Angeles, Calif., on the same day at 3 a. m. I congratulate my old friend, Mr. Jack Frye, and may I say that Howard Hughes appears to be one wealthy young man in this country who has put his money to good use and substantial scientific work and he ought to be complimented. Too many in his position do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD today a long report on the Aleutian Islands. I spent some time up there during January. It is a little known war front. I am sure the Members will be interested in reading it. A substantial portion of it of necessity had to be deleted by the Navy, but the remaining generalizations will suffice to give a good picture of this northern frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the subject of the Aleutian Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DILWEG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, first in connection with Religious Book Week and the other on the subject Refugees in the Far East.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

THE RIGHT OF NEW YORK SOLDIERS TO VOTE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if ever soldiers are getting a run-around, it is those of my State of New York. A Governor has refused to provide any easy method for them to obtain the ballot. Each and every man must personally and in writing apply for the ballot and otherwise satisfy the cumbersome provisions of this Dewey "soldier-can't-vote law."

Months will elapse before the ballot is received in New Guinea, Iran, or India.

We sought to simplify the process in New York so that the wives, parents, or relatives could ask for the ballot for the soldiers, but with Draconian cruelty Dewey said "No." Pontifically and from on high he proclaims, "If a soldier wants to vote, he will vote my way or not vote at all."

Furthermore, he must vote for an entire ticket, from President down to and including constable, dogcatcher, and judge of the local pie-eating contest. Finally, to add to the injustice, members of the Red Cross and merchant marine cannot vote at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made last night and also an article entitled "An Alien Speaks."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters, telegrams, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York who just finished speaking, practically charges Governor Dewey with an attempt to steal an election. There is absolutely no foundation for such a statement. If I caught the gentleman's remarks correctly, what he is kicking about is that due to the insistence of the New York Legislature and Governor Dewey, the

soldiers will have a chance to vote for county, city, State, and national candidates they desire to see nominated and elected. What this gentleman would like to have them do is have the legislature turn over the voting machinery to either the American Labor Party, the Communists, or to the new dealers. That will not be done. Due to Governor Dewey and the New York Legislature the soldiers are going to vote and they are going to vote their own convictions. It is not going to be a typical New York Tammany vote theft. Some are sore because the New Deal will not be in a position to control the soldier vote. The racket-busting prosecutor will do his part to prevent control of soldier voting by political racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of April 16 by Charles A. Merrill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE RIDE OF PAUL REVERE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are somewhat confused as a result of the speeches of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The first two gentlemen showed how we have speeded up air-mail delivery, so as to fly across the continent in a few hours, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] seems to think it is not fast enough to get ballots to our boys in the service.

Today is the anniversary of another great flight, one of the most important in all history. It is the anniversary of the midnight ride of Paul Revere, which inspired the American people to renewed vigor in the War of the Revolution, that resulted in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, with its sacred Bill of Rights, as well as all those American institutions which we now enjoy.

On that Constitution we based the law covering the right of the soldiers to vote.

Every one of them is going to get to vote a free and a complete ballot whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] likes it or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House the following: Messrs. McGEHEE, KEOGH, and PITTENGER.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GARNET CHARLES WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the first individual bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1718, for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to nominate and appoint, by and with the advice of the Senate, Garnet Charles Williams, formerly lieutenant colonel, infantry, Eighty-seventh Infantry Brigade, Forty-fourth Division of the National Guard of the United States in the Army of the United States, a lieutenant colonel in the National Guard of the United States in the Army of the United States as of December 19, 1940, and place him immediately on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant colonel as of said 19th day of December 1940, with the same privileges and retired pay as provided by law for officers of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. WIDBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3674, for the relief of William E. Widby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 777), William E. Widby, who has received compensation under such act for injury suffered on December 15, 1938, while an employee of the Works Progress Administration, is relieved of any liability to refund to the United States any sum in excess of \$600, in the event a settlement in the amount of \$1,800 is made by him or on his behalf in satisfaction of his claim against a third party on account of such injury.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK HOLEHAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 962, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$3,190.21, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damage to certain property owned by them, which resulted when a United States Navy airplane crashed into such property on November 25, 1942, and for loss of rent from such property as a result of such damage: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK KNOWLES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1399, for the relief of Frank Knowles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Knowles, of Montgomery, Ala., the sum of \$110, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of three typewriters owned by him which were destroyed by fire while on loan to the Work Projects Administration, at Opelika, Ala., on November 21, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE A. GIDDENS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1433, for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence A. Giddens, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of \$4,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for the death of his daughter, Betty Lou Giddens, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when an Army airplane crashed into the apartment of the said Clarence A. Giddens on June 5, 1943; (2) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by his

daughter, Carol March Giddens, as a result of such accident; (3) for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries and death; and (4) for compensation for loss and damage to his personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER EUGENE HAYES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1484, for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter Eugene Hayes, the sum of \$4,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government for damages sustained by the said Walter Eugene Hayes on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when a truck owned and operated by him was struck by a United States Army airplane attempting to make an emergency landing on United States Highway No. 101, near Arroyo Grande, Calif., on May 6, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. GUY DORSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3296, for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay R. Guy Dorsey, the sum of \$7,000, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, in full settlement of claim for damages as a result of being struck by an Army truck on July 29, 1942, at the intersection of Kneeland Street and Harrison Avenue, Boston, Mass.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the comma, insert "of Bay Pines, Fla."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$7,000" and insert "\$2,515," and after the word "any," strike

out the word "moneys" and insert "money in the Treasury."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "claim for damages" and insert "all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of wages, medical and hospital expenses."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY SCHULTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3977, for the relief of Harry Schultz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Schultz, the sum of \$1,560.89. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property owned by him caused by a United States Navy airplane on October 30, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCH A. BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4361, for the relief of Arch A. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$169 to Arch A. Brown, Union City, Ind. (formerly Manteo, N. C.), in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of travel expense of transportation of personal and household effects, and use of own conveyance, due to his transfer from manager, Shelby Forest recreational demonstration area, Millington, Tenn., to manager, Cape Hatteras, national seashore project LD-NC-13, Manteo, N. C., while an employee of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAFF SGT. MARION JOHNSON AND
SGT. GEORGE B. KRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1517, for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, the sum of \$283.50, and to Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve, the sum of \$214, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the value of their personal camera equipment lost in a fire in the Marine Corps Recruiting Station, 76 Forsyth Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., on August 25, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY
PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1542, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such

sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$4,797.15, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3, at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. S. E. McCARTY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1632, for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty, Supply Corps, United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$388.25 to reimburse Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on August 17, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. MAJ. RICHARD SHAKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1676, for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant Major Shaker, United States Marine Corps, the sum of \$85, which sum represents the value of a radio lost while in the custody of the Marine Corps authorities at Quantico, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (JR. GR.) NEWT A. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1677, for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunner Unit, Dam Neck, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$272.50 to reimburse Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of the Aviation Free Gunner Unit, Dam Neck, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1681, to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,483.36, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire that destroyed quarters assigned to certain officers of Marine Utility Squadron 152 on February 9, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. R. D. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1045, for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. R. D. Robinson (formerly Miss Kay Bayne), the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. R. D. Robinson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on April 28, 1940, when the automobile in which she was riding on the highway between Columbus, Ga., and Fort Benning, Ga., was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESSIE C. SELMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1668, for the relief of Lessie C. Selman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lessie C. Selman, Quincy, Fla., the sum of \$1,754.39. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lessie C. Selman against the United States arising out of damage to real and personal property on March 22, 1942, when a United States Army aircraft crashed on her farm and destroyed a tobacco barn and its contents.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after "March", insert "22."

At the end of the bill insert the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. G. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2470, for the relief of J. G. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to J. G. Sullivan, of Woodson, Tex., for permanent and total physical disability incident to and sustained as a result of the use of sodium arsenite poison to control grasshoppers on his farm in May 1938, this poison having been furnished by the United States Department of Agriculture without directions for its use, causing permanent disability from the effects of multiple arthritis: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

Line 6, strike out "for permanent and total physical disability incident to and" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. R. DIXON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2624, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of J. R. Dixon, of Nansemond County, Va., against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of injuries to certain oyster beds and oysters on such beds, operated by the said J. R. Dixon under perpetual franchise or lease from the Commonwealth of Virginia, caused by officers, employees, and/or agents of the United States in performing dredging operations in the Nansemond River during the year 1940. Such suit shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "the", insert "latches or."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "year", insert in lieu thereof the word "years."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "1940", insert in lieu thereof "1941, 1942, and/or 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK BAPTISTE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2788, for the relief of Frank Baptiste.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Baptiste, of Hilo, Hawaii, T. H., the sum of \$507, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the monetary loss suffered by reason of the death of his wife, Matilda D'Almeida Baptiste, when she was run down and killed on the public highway by a servant of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$507" and insert "\$2,507."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "monetary loss suffered by reason of the."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "States", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT WILL STARKS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2874, for the relief of Robert Will Starks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Will Starks, Lewisburg, Tenn., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Will Starks against the United States for personal injuries sustained on March 22, 1942, when he was severely burned while working in the laundry of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Georgia", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GRACE PAGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3038, for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Grace Page, of Oakland, Calif., the sum of \$1,399.08, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and hospital, medical, and other expenses incident thereto, and for property damage, sustained when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a dump truck of the United States Engineer Corps, at about 8:45 a. m., on December 14, 1942, at the intersection of Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard, in the city of Oakland, Calif.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$1,399.08" and insert "\$645.08."

Page 2 line 4, after the word "Calif.", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN GELLATLY

The Clerk called the next business, House Resolution 139.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2015) entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased, and/or Charlayne Whiteley Gellatly, as administratrix of the estate of John Gellatly, deceased," now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved May 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the House of Representatives in accordance therewith.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL M. FRASURE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1477, for the relief of Carl M. Frasure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected; and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MARY HERTZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 527, for the relief of Mary Hertz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Hertz, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries sustained by the said Mary Hertz on October 16, 1941, when she was severely and permanently injured as a result of the careless and negligent manner in which the Work Projects Administration was engaged in the installation of water and sewage pipes at the southeast corner of Van Cortlandt Park South and Gouverneur Avenue, in the borough of the Bronx, city of New York, State of New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONRAD H. CLARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 933, for the relief of Conrad H. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Conrad H. Clark, of Cranston, R. I., the sum of \$500, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses suffered by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred in Cranston, R. I., on February 27, 1929, when the automobile which he was operating was struck by a Government-owned Ford coach and operated by an employee of the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person vio-

lating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$500", insert "and to pay the sum of \$200 to Rocco Cellette, of Cranston, R. I."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and loss of wages."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "him" and insert in lieu thereof "them."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "he was operating" and insert in lieu thereof "they were riding."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "Work Projects" and insert in lieu thereof "Works Progress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SALFI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2387, for the relief of John Salfi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Salfi, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$6,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained, and expenses incurred, as the result of a collision, on October 10, 1940, in Westerly, R. I., between the automobile in which the said John Salfi was a passenger and a National Youth Administration truck operated by Louis Gradilone, an employee of the National Youth Administration. No part of the sum appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by any agent or agents or attorney or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with such claim; and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents or attorney or attorneys to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any part of the amount so appropriated in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not to exceed \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$3,046.55."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,046.55" and insert "\$2,046.55."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUFFY BROS., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2576, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the lapse of time and notwithstanding section 4 of the act of June 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 975), jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to consider all questions of law and fact and to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc., resulting from alleged increased costs of performing a contract entered into between said Duffy Bros., Inc., and the United States, said costs allegedly being increased as a result of the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 193): *Provided*, That such suit shall be brought within 6 months of the enactment of this act.

Any judgment rendered in favor of the claimant, Duffy Bros., Inc., shall be paid in the same manner as other judgments of said Court of Claims are paid.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLOSSIE LEESER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2601, for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leeser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Flossie Leeser, of Tulsa, Okla., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital, and medical expenses, sustained as a result of being run into and knocked down by a United States soldier at Miami Beach, Fla., on January 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WINNIE O'DELL SINGLETON AND JIMMIE DALE SINGLETON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2916, for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton, a sum of \$5,000; to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as duly and legally appointed and qualified administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased, the sum of \$685; to Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims arising from

the death of Gaylord W. Singleton, husband of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and father of Jimmie Dale Singleton, the said Gaylord W. Singleton having been killed in an airplane accident on August 26, 1942, at the Lubbock Army Flying School, Lubbock, Tex., the said Gaylord W. Singleton being post tailor for said Lubbock Army Flying School and his said death occurring as the result of the crash of two Army planes which collided in midair and one of which fell into the tailor shop operated by deceased, crushing him to death.

Payment of the \$5,000 for Jimmie Dale Singleton, a minor, shall be made to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as the duly authorized and qualified legal guardian of said minor. The \$5,000 provided for her in her own individual right shall be paid directly to her. The \$685 being compensation for the loss of four sewing machines, threads, braids, and other materials storage cases, mirrors, and other tailor-shop equipment belonging to the said Gaylord W. Singleton, shall be paid to Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton as duly and legally appointed and qualified administratrix of the estate of the said Gaylord W. Singleton: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid, delivered to, or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and it shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after the word "to", down to and including the word "Singleton" on page 2, line 20, and insert "Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased, the sum of \$5,035, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from the death of said Gaylord W. Singleton, who was killed on August 26, 1942, as the result of the crash of an Army airplane at the Lubbock Army Flying School, Lubbock, Tex."

Amend the title.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased."

ROSS ENGINEERING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2965, for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ross Engineering Co., of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$5,964.22. Such sum represents the amount of occupation taxes, interest, and penalties paid by Ross Engineering Co., herein called the con-

tractor, to the State of West Virginia, in connection with the contractor's contract with the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, for the construction of a post office and courthouse at Fairmont, W. Va. The contract was entered into on July 26, 1940, and was to be performed within 360 days thereafter upon a Federal area over which the United States exercised exclusive jurisdiction by virtue of a grant from the Legislature of West Virginia, which reserved to the State only the right of the State to serve process thereon. At the time such contract was entered into the State of West Virginia had no authority to levy or collect from the contractor any State taxes with respect thereto, and in estimating the cost of the work the contractor excluded all State taxes. After such contract had been entered into and partly performed by the contractor the Congress enacted an act (Public, No. 819, 76th Cong.), approved October 9, 1940, and effective January 1, 1941, which relaxed the exclusive jurisdiction exercised by the United States over various Federal areas so as to permit the several States to levy and collect from contractors under Government contracts, and others, sales, use, and income taxes not theretofore collectible by the several States because of the exclusive jurisdiction exercised by the United States over the Federal area. Acting in pursuance of this act of Congress, the State of West Virginia was enabled to levy and collect from the contractor the sum above referred to as an occupation tax of 2 percent upon the gross income from the contract received after January 1, 1941.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES, POSTMASTER, ALBANY, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3388, for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$5,685.53. Such sum represents a shortage in the account of the said John P. Hayes caused by thefts of post-office fund by a former clerk who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such thefts. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of the said John P. Hayes in the sum of \$5,685.53. The surety on the bond of the said John P. Hayes is released from any liability on account of such shortage.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill. Insert in lieu thereof: "That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$5,685.53; that the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$5,189.87. Such sums represent a shortage in the accounts of said postmasters, caused by theft of post-office funds by a former clerk who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such thefts. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John P. Hayes in the sum of \$5,685.53 and to credit the account of the estate of John P. McCormack in the sum of \$5,189.87. The surety on the bond of said

postmasters is released from any liability on account of such shortage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of John P. McCormack, former postmaster at Albany, N. Y."

BILLIE STOOKSBERRY AND LON L. STOOKSBERRY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3535, for the relief of Billie Stooksberry and Lon L. Stooksberry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to Billie Stooksberry, a minor, 9 years of age, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries inflicted on the said Billie Stooksberry, on July 15, 1943, resulting in the breaking of one of his legs, fracturing his skull, and otherwise wounding, bruising, and injuring him throughout his entire body and limbs, which said injuries are permanent; said Billie Stooksberry being thus injured while he was walking on and along the edge of Highway No. 61, about one-half mile north of Clinch River near Moores Bridge in Anderson County, Tenn., by being struck by an automobile which was the property of the United States and one of its agencies, Clinton Engineer Works, bearing license No. 1A-188, at the time being used by employees and officials of the United States and said Clinton Engineer Works, within the scope of their employment on official business, and which automobile was at the time driven and operated by Benny M. Buckner, an employee of the United States and of said Clinton Engineer Works and which at and prior to the time it struck said Billie Stooksberry, was being driven on and along said Public Highway No. 61, at a high dangerous, wantonly negligent, and unlawful rate of speed, and in a wantonly negligent manner; and the sum of \$5,000 to Lon L. Stooksberry, the father of said minor, Billie Stooksberry, to reimburse him for moneys spent by him for doctor bills, hospital bills, medicine, and otherwise spent by him in the effort on his part to have his said minor son treated for and, insofar as possible, cured of his aforesaid injuries, and for the loss of services of said minor son: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words, "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill down to the colon on page 2, line 23, and insert in lieu thereof " \$3,500 to the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor; and to pay the

sum of \$974.23 to Lon L. Stooksberry, of Clinton, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses sustained as the result of Billie Stooksberry being struck by a United States Army vehicle on July 15, 1943, near Moores Bridge in Anderson County, Tenn."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry."

WESIX ELECTRIC HEATER CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3739, for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Wesix Electric Heater Co., San Francisco, Calif., the sum of \$1,507.24. Such sum represents the amount deducted during October and November 1940 from the contract price of certain heaters furnished by the said Wesix Electric Heater Co. to the Panama Canal. Such deduction was made because of delay in the performance of the contract, such delay being alleged by the said Wesix Electric Heater Co. to have occurred because of (1) the fact that it was impossible for the company to comply with certain incorrect specifications of the contract until they were modified, and (2) indecisive action on the part of the Panama Canal after it was notified of this fact.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "\$1,507.24" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,297.80."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. BIRD GILES AND SHERMAN BECK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3859, for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums of \$180 to E. Bird Giles, of Belle Fourche, S. Dak., and \$483 to Sherman Beck, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., in full settlement of their claims against the United States for services rendered the Department of Agriculture as

farm-debt adjustment committeemen in South Dakota, from August 1936 through July 1937. Such sum, in each case, represents the difference between the salary stipulated by the farm-debt adjustment supervisor and the salary actually received on account of said services as farm-debt adjustment committeemen.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$493", insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$251.50."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the War Production Board, and his reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a program delivered over the Mutual network on Friday, March 17, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. William T. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4254) extending the provisions of the Lend-Lease

Act for 1 year, with Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the lend-lease program is now entering the home stretch of its run. For 3 years it has been a mighty dynamic force in the war against the Axis. It has proven to be an invaluable military and psychological instrument in the welding of United Nations power into common effort and common purpose. On the basis of the President's periodic reports and the testimony before our committee, I feel that Congress should and will extend the program for another year.

Many were honestly skeptical of the lend-lease program when the legislation was first before Congress. At that time we were not at war, but, with a great part of the world already on fire, realization came that we must get our fire-fighting machinery in order.

When lend-lease first became law it carried two main objectives. First, to help Britain, Russia, and China to hold the line while we armed. Second, to underwrite the great expense industry in this country would have to incur in changing over from peacetime to war production. What American industry has done in changing over to war production is one of the wonders of history. Industry could not have taken that financial risk without assurance that this Government would underwrite the expense of the change through lend-lease purchases. Thus, through this program the United States not only provided an arsenal for democracies already at war, but also started rolling the industrial wheels of preparedness at home.

If there was any legitimate argument why the lend-lease program should not have been inaugurated before we entered the war there can be none that it should not be continued now, since we are in this conflict to the hilt. We are not going to discontinue now what has proved to be one of the most effective instruments of our cause.

From the time the original Lend-Lease Act was passed on March 11, 1941, to the end of 1943 the United States under this act conveyed goods and services valued at about \$20,000,000,000. More than two-thirds of this aid was rendered during 1943. This \$20,000,000,000 has covered a little over 14 percent of the total cost of the war to date, and to my mind it is doubtful whether any other 14 percent of the total cost has done more to finally steer the United Nations on the road to victory. If you will read the testimony before our committee, you cannot but be convinced of the vital, if not deciding, part that lend-lease has played in this war. It is easy to conclude that if it had not been for the tanks, planes, motor vehicles, machine parts, and gasoline sent around the world to Montgomery's army in Egypt, Rommel's army might have not been forced to retreat, and Africa might not now be cleared of the enemy.

If it had not been for lend-lease supplies flown thousands of miles over the

highest mountains in the world to China, that heroic nation may well have considered herself abandoned by her allies.

If it had not been for the thousands of trucks, vehicles, tanks, and planes and the thousands of tons of supplies sent to Russia, the Germans might not be on the run in Europe today.

If it had not been for lend-lease and the planes, high-octane gasoline, plane parts, and other equipment, the R. A. F. would not have been able to build itself into so gigantic a force and operate with such destructive effects upon Germany.

These are some of the things that lend-lease has done.

From the very first, lend-lease has been a give and take proposition. Through it we have received certain benefits from our allies. On account of circumstances and ability to deliver, we have only taken about one-tenth of what we have given and most of this has come from the British Commonwealth.

When lend-lease was first enacted into law Mr. Churchill called it the most unsordid act in all recorded history. That statement was true then and it is true now. It was the fruition of our good-neighbor policy and of our avowed intention to hold out the helping hand to those fighting despotism anywhere.

We want nothing out of this war but assurance of a peaceful world. That, too, is an unsordid desire. We have a right to expect that our allies in this war take lend-lease in the spirit in which it is given and by their actions, now and hereafter, show that they appreciate that spirit.

We are now on the road to victory, and victory will surely come if the spirit of lend-lease dwells in the midst of the United Nations and holds them together until the bitter end. Germany and Japan and their satellites have no possible chance of achieving anything like victory, or even a stalemate, out of this war unless misunderstanding, distrust, and selfishness rear their heads among the United Nations before common victory is reached.

The Atlantic Charter, the Washington Conference of United Nations, the Moscow Conference, the Teheran Conference all voice unity of purpose now and after peace comes. A policy of no separate peace has been guaranteed by these conferences. The "four freedoms" have been acknowledged. The right of peoples to the government of their choice has been guaranteed. The right of small nations to sit on a basis of equality with the great in forming the post-war world has been admitted. The principle of our international body to preserve and enforce world peace has been approved.

Mr. Hull's 17 points also embody these principles clearly and admirably. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull these pledges have become the foreign policy of the United States. They have not deviated from the broad lines of this policy. Though beset with the demands of minorities here, there, and everywhere that a more specific and detailed foreign policy be enunciated, they have never wavered in their faith in the broad principles of our policy. As a

needle to the pole, they have clung to this general policy, realizing that our first and major objective is to win this war and that until the war is won foreign and military policy must be in some respects one and the same, and that the assertion of American post-war rights at this time may impair the war effort and give comfort not only to the enemy but also to some in this country who seek political advantage this summer by demanding now a more specific and detailed foreign policy.

The President and the Secretary of State have claimed nothing for the people of the United States out of this war but a decent world to live in. Doubtless they realize that our post-war needs will require additional outposts of defense, particularly in the Pacific, but they also realize that, in the interest of harmony in our military effort and success in our common cause, any claim that we may have to present to insure the defense of the United States should be agreed upon now by all concerned, or wait until victory is won. Those in charge of our foreign relations have made no policy announcement without consultation with others of our allies.

It is to be regretted that all of our allies have not followed the same unselfish course which explicitly or by implication they agreed to in their joint meetings with us. Already zones of influence are being declared and national claims are being advanced without consultation with us. Russia has announced that she will handle the Polish question in her own way, thus creating in some quarters distrust of her purposes.

Recently the unkindest and most disturbing cut of all came from the Commonwealths of Australia and New Zealand. These countries, saved from destruction by American arms, the recipients of lend-lease materials by the millions of tons and articles, these people whom we admire and love and respect because they would rather die than lose their liberty, this sturdy race which has proven its valor on the battlefields of the world, the Government of these people, though it knows that the United States must be the principal grantor of peace in the Pacific hereafter, and that for our own defense and security we must have additional air and naval bases in the Pacific to see that militarism in Japan does not again rear its ugly head, knowing that they are not powerful enough alone to preserve peace in that sphere—knowing all this, the Governments of Australia and New Zealand on January 21 entered into a unilateral pact which in effect served notice on the world that these two members of the British Empire must have a predominant say-so in any disposition or administration of the islands of the Pacific, including the Marshalls, Marianas, Carolines, Pelews, and other islands, Japanese possession of which doomed the Philippines, Guam, and Wake.

The pact asserts that the two nations will unitedly oppose any change of sovereignty in any islands of the Pacific without their consent. It asserts sole regional control of all Pacific islands

south of the Equator. It hands us a crumb by agreeing to the creation of a South Seas regional advisory commission with England, France, and the United States as members. So far as we are concerned, membership of the United States in this body would be an empty honor. New Zealand would have one vote, Australia one—and they have agreed to vote together on any Pacific Ocean issue—England one, France one, and the United States one. We would be out-voted in the beginning and our say-so would amount to nothing. The pact assumes that the United States would acknowledge that the Anzacs had title to the islands in the zone mentioned south of the Equator when as a matter of fact we could in self-respect admit no such thing.

The general objective of this Australian-New Zealand agreement seems to be to secure post-war civil aviation and shipping advantages in the Pacific. If this be so, then the step is in line with the oldest principles of the British Empire which call for control of the channels of trade and commerce.

This is no time to argue about trading posts, but since the point has been forced upon us we need not ignore the fact that prosperity for the United States after this war will be dependent to an important degree upon the possession of shipping and aviation outposts as well as military outposts.

The agreement in no way recognizes nor appreciates the present dependence of its signatories on the American Army, Navy, and Air Force, and that our boys are dying by the thousands to defend that area now.

So far as I have been able to learn the United States received no notice that the pact was under consideration, nor was the United States invited to participate.

I have been unable to find out whether Great Britain proper was notified of or invited to the conference. If so, she was a silent partner to the agreement. If not, then the action of New Zealand and Australia should be and probably is very embarrassing to their mother country.

In voting for the continuation of lend-lease, I feel that Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, China, and Russia should know and acknowledge that there are certain additional bases in the Pacific area essential to the defense of the United States and that they should be permanently occupied by the United States to prevent future aggression. Without other island bases to support them Guam and the Philippines have been and will continue to be indefensible. Events have shown that our allies are dependent on the United States to protect the Pacific. If we are to protect that area during this war, we must have bases. If we are to police that area to preserve the peace after this war, we must have police stations from which to operate. The Allied commissions meeting in London should now be discussing this problem and finding a solution to it. The United States must have advance agreements in this connection.

To win this war we must have unity. It may not be wise at this time for the United States to assert its territorial needs in the Pacific. Certainly we should not do so during the progress of this war unless we have come to complete agreement with our allies. The assertion of separate zones of influence such as has been announced jointly by Australia and New Zealand without consultation with other friendly powers is a menace to the successful prosecution of this war, can only sow distrust and discord among the United Nations, and will defeat the purpose of those who visualize a great international body to preserve and maintain the peace after the war is over. If we cannot work cooperatively during this war when we need each other, we can never do so afterward when immediate danger is past.

The unselfish ideal of the lend-lease program—the give and take spirit of this program—should and must be observed during this conflict and the period following victory; else, another generation will see its sons die on the battlefields of the world because of lack of an effective, unselfish world cooperative organization to preserve and maintain the peace.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to report to the House some aspects of lend-lease I observed while on a recent trip through the European theater of operations, during which I spent 2 weeks in England and a week in north Africa.

Military mutual war aid is operating very satisfactorily. Everyone now takes it as a matter of course. Remember that the Allied military commands are thoroughly mixed up as to personnel, with an American having a Britisher as his deputy or vice versa, and so forth. Each command in each field of operations is calling for just about all of the troops and supplies it can get. No one pays much attention as to where the troops or supplies come from. All of it is needed to defeat the enemy. On the military side, an American observer is more impressed with our direct military aid to the common war effort, the 86 percent our own troops are using, than the indirect war aid, the 14 percent we are furnishing our allies. On the other hand, in England the war aid furnished us, the so-called reverse lend-lease, is impressive. The bomber bases built and maintained for us are spread all over England. The British radio location system, which is mentioned briefly in the committee report and which is still highly secret, is an unbelievably accurate system for flying control in operations near the enemy and is saving American air crews and bombers wherever they understand it and use it.

There are other phases of so-called reverse lend-lease, which our troops, who are the best paid, fed, and clothed in the world, do not greatly appreciate. A. G. I. talking to us in London said, "You Congressmen should do something about this reverse lend-lease underwear we are getting from the British. It doesn't fit and it scratches." Thus,

American troops are being brought in contact with different standards of living among our allies in a very graphic, although scratchy, way through reverse lend-lease.

The nonmilitary phases of lend-lease are not operating as satisfactorily from our standpoint. While the continued functioning of British economy is, of course, necessary to the war effort, it seems to me that our arrangements must somehow be put upon a more businesslike basis. So far as this country is concerned, these phases of lend-lease form a part of our whole foreign economic administration in fact, as well as in name. Where to draw the line between economic and military activities is difficult, and where to distinguish between war activities and the beginning of post-war activities is difficult, but we must start to draw these lines soon. The head of our foreign economic mission in London, Mr. Phil Reed, seemed to me to be doing a very good job in a very difficult situation. Lend-lease is only one of the many economic activities which are covered in his office. I understand that machinery we furnish which has a post-war use is now being paid for by the British. This is a good beginning.

In north Africa the distinction is clearly drawn between military lend-lease and economic cooperation. We are furnishing mutual war aid, as in other theaters, and on the same basis, but economic aid is paid for in cash, even though this aid is of direct benefit in the war effort. The foreign exchange situation of the French Committee of Liberation is not as good as it was during the period of great military activity in north Africa. The frozen French assets in this country give us ample security for any advances we may make. Our relations with the French Committee, as trustees for the French Republic, are not in a satisfactory state from the standpoint of either side. I hope progress is being made toward a better relationship.

I sat in at a meeting of the North African Economic Board and witnessed the way in which this Board handles the mixture of economic and military questions which confront it. I saw our Army representatives dealing with members of this Board. I do not believe I should reveal the details of the transactions, but I was deeply impressed with the businesslike way the board went about their job.

Mutual war aid must, of course, be continued so long as we are at war. Lend-lease as a post-war economic mechanism will not work, and we must remember that many post-war activities are starting, and should start, now while the war continues. The Eden white paper, which forbids the reexport of lend-lease materials should be revised on a business basis which is satisfactory to the British economy and to our economy.

I want to see our future relations with our allies, and particularly with Britain, be close and satisfactory, but to be close they must be satisfactory to all concerned, mutually satisfactory.

The day I was in Parliament, March 14, a number of interesting things happened.

The resolution inviting Member of Congress to visit Parliament was adopted, and some fine speeches were made on Anglo-American relations.

Later, there was a debate on post-war civil aviation during which one member said that the United States "would like to dominate the world's air—just as this country dominated the oceans in the nineteenth century—a perfectly legitimate aspiration, but one in which, I think, we must have our say as well."

Other Members expressed the same thought and urged that British Empire controlled air bases be used in bargaining for air rights. When we talk about getting air bases in return for lend-lease, I think of those speeches. I realize that the final settlements must go far beyond the scope of lend-lease to be satisfactory to us or any other country. Now is not the time to attempt to outline what those settlements should be, but I suggest that, insofar as Britain is concerned, the lend-lease plan whereby a nation with one-half as many voters as we have, less than one-fourth our national income, and one-tenth our contribution to lend-lease, should not forever have a 50-50 control through combined boards of the bulk of our foreign economic activities. We are used to the ways of representative government, where numbers of voters count; we understand the corporate method, where each votes his stock interest. A combination of these might work. Whatever the arrangements are, they must be satisfactory to Congress.

On that same day in Parliament a member asked the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, whether he could "give an assurance that no final or binding commitment in regard to post-war trade or Empire economic policy will be entered upon by the Government until such a matter has been freely debated in the House."

The Prime Minister answered, "Yes, sir."

I think we should obtain the same assurance from our Executive by amending the lend-lease law itself. Up to date lend-lease has been characterized by trust in our allies and suspicion of Congress. This will have to change. We must provide by law for congressional approval of our post-war economic policies when we extend lend-lease possibilities until 1948, as we do in this 1-year extension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am not one who likes to bring up matters for the purpose of creating any disturbing incidents, but for the purpose of having a fair understanding of the situation, I call the gentleman's attention to an incident reported in a letter handed me last week. It was written by a boy who is in Iran. He stated as

a matter of personal knowledge that the 5-gallon cans of gasoline which are furnished by us to the British under lend-lease at \$2.50 a can are purchased back by the United States Government at \$55. He cited some other incidents along that line. It may be that under lend-lease there may never be any repayment, or it may be that there will be just a lot of bookkeeping, but I am wondering if the gentleman thinks that in connection with the extension of lend-lease we can have some understanding that if any materials we furnish any other country are in turn refurbished to this country for our own use, the rate of charge shall be the same as that made when we extend the aid in the first place?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not know about the incident mentioned by the gentleman. If the facts are as given by your correspondent, then this is a shocking practice which should be stopped. As to the reports I heard about, I tried to run them down and found a very good explanation or found that the report was not true. For instance, I read in the London papers about how 40,000 lend-lease radios had been sent over there and there was a kick made that they were not being made available to the public for sale. I took that up with Mr. Reid and found there had not been any lend-lease radios for civilian use, but that they had been sent over to complete an old commercial order and they were properly being put on public sale.

I think we have got to watch to keep from straining at gnats and swallowing camels. The unimportant thing, in my judgment, is what happens with the stuff that has been lend-leased. As you all know, I think lend-lease is a phony as a label for what we are doing. What happens to second-hand gunpowder and a number of other war materials is not very important. What is of enormous importance is the arrangement we make for the future. These agreements will not be as a matter of settlement for past lend-lease, but will be as a matter of future business interest, political interest, and military interest, in preserving the peace and prosperity of the world for ourselves and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In these agreements looking to the future, I think the negotiators for our country must, among other things, look after the interests of our country, the commercial, political, and diplomatic interests, and so forth. But I do not think that we are going to get very far in talking about a quid pro quo for lend-lease and that is why I want to see arrangements other than military lend-lease kept out of the lend-lease picture. I think steps are being made in that direction.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to ask the gentleman just what is being done definitely in regard to the bases, air bases,

particularly, that we have built both in the Pacific and in the Atlantic as to protecting the rights of our country and the tremendous sums which have been expended. In regard to that matter, can the gentleman give us any definite information?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I cannot give any definite information because there is not any definite information right now. I was at 14 air bases which I would consider of great strategic importance right now, and many of them will be of great strategic importance for a long time to come. Many of those air bases were built with British funds. However, they are thickly populated with American-built planes, both the ones we are flying and lend-lease planes. It does not do any good to make an arrangement about an air base unless you can arrange about the air between that air base and the next base. I think that one of the matters which we ought to go into and get a settlement about now is a post-war arrangement with as many countries as we can, but particularly with the British, as to civil-aviation rights on a basis that will be mutually satisfactory. That is the gist of the debate I heard in the Parliament. I happen not to be an enthusiast for the national monopoly system, which was advocated strenuously that day, or the international corporation system that the Socialists in Parliament were mentioning. I favor our American competitive system. But I think we have got to make those agreements sometime, and, of course, they will involve our bases. If we get the bases back and do not get the rights as to air travel to go with them, the bases would not be very valuable.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the Congress should have some say-so regarding the lend-lease supplies of stock piles in foreign countries after the war is over? We had a very bitter experience with Japan when this country, over my strenuous and bitter protests, was shipping cotton and scrap iron. A great deal of it went out of the port of Boston. I saw a ship going out to Japan loaded with scrap iron, cotton, and other commodities of war which are now being used against us. We do not know what the Allies will do after the war, but we hope, of course, that they will be with us, and we will be with them.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think that Congress should have submitted for its consideration the general policies and agreements with reference to the disposition of these materials. I do not think that Congress is in a position to deal very intelligently or effectively with this jeep or that tank.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What I had reference to was stock piles of materials.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not think that Congress is in a position to deal very intelligently or effectively with this pile of material or that pile of material. I think, however, that the policy should

be submitted for congressional approval for the disposition of lend-lease materials after the war. Let us not get into our minds that this war is going to end like the last one and that there will be a certain minute one day when the war is going on and the next minute when it will not be going on. I think there is quite a possibility that this war may trail off and may not end up that way. We want to make our plans for post-war activities that will start while the war is going on and we want to make as many arrangements as we can for post-war plans while the war is going on.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We do not want an arrangement with Japan.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Insofar as the lend-lease equipment in the hands of our allies after the war, I believe the agreements provide at the present time that that equipment belongs to us and it should be returned to us. I do not see how we can do anything further than provide by agreement concerning such matters. We cannot send an armed guard to assure its return.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With reference to that point I think there is no way in the world to decide in advance what we want to do with second-hand military equipment. Perhaps one of the worst things a country could say to us would be, "Now, this is all yours. You have got to come over here and maintain it." Perhaps the best thing to do with many pieces of material in the shape they are in would be to say, "Could we please scrap it right here?" You have got to wait and see what shape the stuff is in and what use there can be for it elsewhere.

Mutual war aid is a gigantic task. We must keep at it. Post-war planning presents perplexing difficulties. We must get at it. Our country must make both war and post-war plans at the same time. One is the primary responsibility of the Executive. The other is the joint responsibility of the Executive and the Congress. Each branch of our Government must measure up to its full responsibility in this critical time, if we would keep faith with those who are doing the fighting and the dying.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, false rumors, carelessly initiated or idly circulated, in these days of national tension, harm or subvert constructive governmental action. Harmless in their incipency, they tend to destroy the very basis of our plans and hopes. Designed for harm in origin they vitiate and annul attempts for unanimity of national action. False or careless rumors like slanderous gossip are avoided by men of character. Such rumors lengthen war.

The American mind of today is a war mind. Public reaction to a given report is a war reaction. Details of a story designed to incite become inflammatory. The war mind is easily aroused, but assured with difficulty. Man today the

world over is preoccupied with his burden of the present world holocaust and welcomes any opportunity to relieve his tension by the expenditure of mental energy, too often in misdirected and unfortunate attempts to escape the reality of today's life. Rumor mongers know this. Careless or coldly calculating, harmful, or subversive thoughts scattered through vicious mouthings are deliberately planted in some cases by these purveyors of falsity in the mind of those known for loose talk and looser thinking. A harm desired is thus a damage accomplished.

Careful speech and thoughtful expression of opinion based on alleged fact should be the first rule of conduct of every American. We all are conscious of the ease with which the simplest repetition of self-evident truths become distorted. Being aware of this tendency toward indifference in relating reports of events, Americans all should guard against the slightest untruth or equivocation, however simple, in matters affecting public interest. "Speak only the truth which you know to be true" should be the byword of every citizen.

Rumor by innuendo is equally devastating in result.

In one of the leading newspapers of New England, the Boston Herald, there is carried each week a rumor clinic, the purpose of which is to expose false rumors that are carried about the war. Through this medium the Boston Herald has and is performing a great public duty. Newspapers in other parts of the country could well follow this fine example.

I might say the Boston Herald, on its editorial angle is Republican, so my views are purely impersonal. This paper is rendering a great service in conducting the rumor clinic that it does each week.

One of the effective ways that we on the home front can help out is not to believe rumors—and if we hear of any to inquire as to their truth before we repeat them. Rumors are usually circulated to divide us by appealing to our emotions and our prejudices.

The press of our country can help out tremendously in exposing fake rumors. They can also help out by ascertaining the truth first before printing something that is not correct. I do not say this in any critical sense—as the press of our country generally are doing a fine job. Instead of criticism—this is a constructive suggestion.

Members of Congress should also be careful before making sensational and unfounded statements—or making statements on the floor of the House or Senate that appeal to emotions or prejudices without first ascertaining the truth of what they say.

These are days when silence on some occasions and the exercise of prudence on others will help our country.

Unfounded and fake rumors are harmful to our country. They help the enemy. They tend to produce misunderstanding and division. It is strange to note how many of these rumors start in Berlin and Tokyo and come over through German

short-wave broadcasts, and in a few days are accepted by even some well-meaning persons as the truth, without making any inquiry at all; and everywhere we go we meet the rumor being repeated and repeated. That is dangerous. It should be stopped. The only way it can be stopped is by each one of us hearing any rumors checking and inquiring and not repeating them. They can only be stopped by restraint, self-control, the exercise of prudence, and inquiring before repeating.

The lend-lease law passed as a part of our national defense, has been used as a vehicle for all kinds of fake rumors. One follows the other. It seems as though there is an organized effort in some directions, among a small but organized propaganda group, to use this law as a vehicle to create and circulate rumors that are harmful to the conduct of the war.

Some of these rumors have originated in the Congress as a result of utterances by some Members that were later shown to be unfounded and inconsistent with the true facts. Such utterances do harm.

And those Members are very few and far between. The great majority of the membership of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have been acting and speaking with restraint. But unfortunately that cannot be said about all Members.

The testimony of Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Director, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when this bill was under consideration by the committee, shows the danger of such rumors. He testified to the number of rumors that have received wide circulation throughout the country, all of which were false. He could have given testimony to one or two statements made by Members of Congress that were incorrect. Those statements received wide publicity. The truth, when told to the public, received very little publicity.

How often have we heard the rumor—in time believed to be the truth by many fine persons—that lend-lease funds were used for a Washington party, wining and dining, and so forth, an Allied purchasing commission to the United States. That rumor had its bad effect. It was false.

What about the charge made in the newspapers by a Member of Congress—not of this body—that we had purchased large quantities of wheat from the Free French, and paid a much higher price than it could be purchased for here. The effect upon the farmer who grows wheat was harmful. The effect upon our people generally was harmful—throwing our money away. That story received wide circulation. It is still repeated. It was false. The truth is that while we did get a large quantity of wheat, from which thousands of barrels of flour were made, that our soldiers abroad needed, that we gave credit on reverse lend-lease at the prevailing price where the wheat was purchased. We did not pay any actual money for this wheat. Someone was fed a story. Without inquiring he made his startling and sensational charge. The

public was stunned and believed the charge was incorrect but, yet, the damage has been done.

The man who made that harmful charge is a good American. His motive was political—to injure President Roosevelt. The real result was to injure the war effort.

Do you remember the famous diaper story? Another Member of Congress—not of this body—made that startling and sensational charge. He talked before he inquired. Another false impression conveyed to the American people.

There are many others that I will not mention, as the ones I have ought to be sufficient to show the danger of rumors and passing them along before inquiring.

The great majority of the Members of Congress are conscious of their responsibility in not making statements that produce misunderstanding and division among our people. Every Member should.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has it occurred to the gentleman that many of these baseless rumors gain circulation because the administration insists on keeping the American people in the dark as to what is going on? I would like to get the gentleman's views on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Rather than answer the gentleman's question, let me state my views broadly. What I say has nothing but the hope that rumors will not be passed on. My view, in answer to the gentleman's question—and eliminating the administration—is that the American public should be taken into their confidence by those entrusted with the conduct of government and the conduct of the war to the fullest extent that can be done consistent with the best interests of our country. I think I have answered the gentleman's question without reacting to the particular question, and I am giving my personal views. The American public should be given all the information possible that can be given at a particular time and which will not at that time be inimical to our country's interest; and if at a particular time it is, when that danger passes over, then it should be given to our people as quickly as possible.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is just the reply I expected from the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is not only a very able and valuable Member of this House but who always tries to be fair and take a nonpartisan view of most questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Remember, we can be members of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party, and we can fight hard and honorably for our parties. As a matter of fact, I like to see it, but I do not like to see small, petty stuff—sniping, and so forth. At the same time,

when the interest of our country transcends that of party, country comes first.

A charge made on the floor of the House, or in the Senate, or in the press by a Member of Congress is news, and is naturally and properly carried by the press. If the charge is not correct, and it tends to divide our people, the damage is irreparable. The truth has a difficult time overcoming fake charges when such charges appeal to emotion or prejudice. It is a dangerous game to play in wartime. The facts should be ascertained before charges are made.

The testimony of Mr. Crowley, setting forth a long list of false rumors, should receive wide circulation by the press so that all of us will realize and appreciate the danger to our country of false rumors. His testimony is amazing. It should cause all of us to stop, look, and listen when we hear a rumor, and to inquire as to its truth before repeating.

We must remember that false rumors always divide—they never strengthen our people.

If we pay heed to the testimony of Mr. Crowley about false rumors, and profit thereby, we can greatly assist our country during the remaining days of the war.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this pending measure, H. R. 4254, which provides for the extension of the lend-lease law, presents some very serious aspects. In this Chamber where so many debates have occurred, and where so many appropriation bills have been passed for the benefit of our allies, both before and during this war, many of us view with alarm the implications of this measure. While each one of us want to do everything humanly possible to aid in the winning of this war as quickly as possible—we want our boys to come back home at the very earliest possible moment—yet we do not want our boys who are serving in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and in every branch of the service during this frightful war, to return and find our own country so completely wrecked and torn by debt that life will be a burden and progress will be utterly impossible.

Mr. Chairman, we have financed our own war. In addition to that very heavy burden, we have financed, in large part, the war which is waged by many other countries; we have financed countries, under the provisions of lend-lease, which have not actively participated in this war. Our country, through those in power, has been extremely generous in giving, dispensing, loaning and casting upon many nations, both engaged in active participation in this war, and those who are not actively participating in this war, our money, property, and resources; many of those countries who have received those benefits from us have accepted them, but they have not been in great need of them. Many of the South American countries have received from us vast sums of money, for many things that are not needed for war. They have received the taxpayers' hard-earned

money for needless things—and, yet, those same countries are not involved in this war. They have no active participation in it. And, as we meditate upon our own dismal financial situation in this country, under this same policy pronounced under the lend-lease law I assume those in power, and those who are administering the lend-lease, will continue to give away our money and our property regardless of the hardship that will eventually result to our own people because of it. The operation of lend-lease has been on a one-way boulevard.

Mr. Chairman, when this war is over, and when our soldiers and sailors return home and find a depressed and despondent people caused by an insurmountable debt, and with the many ills that flow therefrom, where factories and mills are idle, where the economic situation is bad, and where the people clamor for the foreign debt to be paid, and nothing is paid or even offered to us, then the people of this Nation, with the soldiers and sailors returned from war, will have something to say.

And, may I observe today, when they discover that this administration has given, to a very large extent, the vast sums of money, the property, our resources, and our stores of property and supplies and that the foreign countries do not owe us anything and they will not pay us anything, but this is our debt, there will be confusion in this country. To a large extent, this has come about through lend-lease. It has been the agency by and through which the people of this country have been both betrayed and hoodwinked—because their hard-earned money, which they supposed was to be used for our war against our enemies, has been lavished upon many countries and for many needless purposes. But the result of a terrific debt will sooner or later catch up with those who engage in creating it. That is inevitable.

Mr. Chairman, whatever is necessary for the promotion of this war to a speedy conclusion, I will support. My record of the past confirms that position. Whatever may be necessary to equip our Army, and our Navy, as the best equipped Army and Navy in the world, I will gladly support. Whatever may be necessary to aid in equipping our active allies, I am in hearty accord with the policy to provide it where it will aid in bringing this war to a speedy termination. But, there should be a complete understanding that this is a loan, and that definite arrangements should be established upon that subject. The days of giving our all away, without any prospect of any return, have passed. We have reached the day when we must deal at arms length with our allies, because we have reached the very bottom of the financial barrel in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this measure should not be passed unless there is some safeguard placed around the spending and giving of our money and resources away. The Congress is the proper body to constitute this group to check the operation of Lend-Lease. In the past, the waste

and the extravagance—the giving of our money away for useless and needless things—has been far beyond the imagination of men. This must not continue. There must be a system whereby the spending and the loaning of our money, our property, and our resources may be limited to the bare necessity for the prosecution of this war. The plan of boondoggling in many foreign countries must be abandoned, and we must get down to the one and single policy of doing those things which are essential for our victory in this war. I will support that plan which will place the Congress in control of the use of the funds under Lend-Lease, insofar as it is possible, because I am convinced that the representatives of the people should have a voice in this program; the people are providing the money for this war; they, through their representatives, should have the right to participate in the decision of those purposes for which their money is to be used.

Mr. Chairman, as we go forward, today, let us go forward in progress, in thought, and in action. Let us give the people the voice they demand in determining the policy under Lend-Lease, and let us demand that the unwise spending and giving of our resources for needless things be abandoned, and that we get down to the one essential thing, today, of winning this war—and when the war is over, to win the peace as a lasting and a permanent peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is to be congratulated, and the country as well, on the spirit of unity that is manifested with reference to the consideration, and, I think, the support of the pending resolution which extends for 1 year the so-called Lend-Lease Administration.

I believe we all realize that with the country at war there must be unity, and there certainly must be unity with reference to the granting of aid to our allies under lend-lease, which has done as much and perhaps more than any other agency of the Government in helping us to win this war.

I want to commend and endorse the remarks just made by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in saying that we should decry petty and unfounded criticism. I do not believe there has been any activity of government where there has been more false rumors circulated than with reference to lend-lease. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has given very serious and prolonged consideration to this measure and to all of the facts pertaining to the administration of lend-lease. Could the entire membership of the House have been present during our hearings of nearly a month on this bill and have heard the explanations and answers made by those who know the facts to these various critics they would be satisfied. Our committee was satisfied and voted unanimously to favorably report this bill.

I want to commend the Administrator of Lend-Lease, or rather the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, Mr. Leo Crowley, and Oscar Cox, its very able general counsel, who have been helpful, frank, and cooperative in giving us information as to the administration of lend-lease. I think the American people should be pleased with the very fine record and the splendid administration that has been made of this agency of the Government. I shudder to think what would have happened to the United States of America if we had not had lend-lease when the attack came upon us at Pearl Harbor.

It was as I stated at the time of its passage by the House in February 1941 a measure for the defense of the United States and we did not take that step any too soon. Lend-lease became a law on March 11, 1941. At that time England was fighting alone. China was fighting alone. Russia was allied with the Axis Powers. England was almost exhausted from daily and nightly bombings and it then seemed only a question of a short time until Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, with Hitler in supreme command, would be the masters of the world. Hitler's submarines had control of the seas and he was mobilizing a force at Dakar in South Africa for an attack on Brazil and Nazi agents and fifth columnists with plenty of Nazi money were operating in the countries of Central and South America, and some of them were carrying on their pernicious activities in our own country, and the whole world was intimidated and frightened by these masters of brute force.

It was a courageous thing and a right thing for our country at such a time to give material aid to those who were fighting these enemies of civilization and lend-lease was the most effective means of giving this aid. England would have fallen long before our entry into the war but for the aid which she received under lend-lease. Russia was invaded and attacked by Hitler within 3 months after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, and but for lend-lease and the supplies she received under it Hitler would have conquered her. Stalin has publicly admitted the supplies received under lend-lease saved Russia. If we had not passed lend-lease when we did it would have been too late and we would be fighting the Axis Powers today by ourselves, and England and Russia would be conquered and occupied countries impotent and helpless like France, Belgium, and the rest.

In the remainder of my time I want to point out somewhat in detail just what is being done and what is being accomplished today under lend-lease.

The Lend-Lease Act is a military instrument of the first importance.

Military items—planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and other finished munitions—have constituted the backbone of the lend-lease program. More than half of our lend-lease aid has been made up of such items. In 1943 they constituted 61 percent of all lend-lease exports and in the month of December 1943, 67 percent.

By January 1, 1944, we had sent to our allies under lend-lease 21,000 planes. Of

these 7,800 went to the Soviet Union and 4,000 to the Allied forces in the Pacific and Far East theaters. A large number of those sent to the Far East have been used to maintain the vital air link with China—"over the hump" from Assam Province in the northeast corner of India to Yunnan Province in the southwest corner of China. The rest went principally to the Middle East, Britain, and training areas all over the world.

By January 1, 1944, we had lend-leased 21,000 tanks and 500,000 military vehicles—truck, jeeps, and scout cars. Three thousand five hundred of the tanks and 175,000 of the motor vehicles have gone for use in the war against Japan. Four thousand seven hundred of the tanks and 230,000 of the motor vehicles have gone to the Soviet Army—more than to any other theater of the war.

And while we have been sending these planes, tanks, military vehicles, and quantities of other military items, we have built and equipped the strongest Army we have ever had in our history and a Navy bigger than any the world has ever seen before. American industry has indeed done a magnificent job.

The next largest group of items we have sent under lend-lease has consisted of supplies and equipment for making or repairing weapons, railroad equipment for hauling goods to the fronts and to the factories, and petroleum products for fighting planes and other combat vehicles. These constitute 20 percent of our lend-lease exports. By sending steel to Britain, for example, we have put to use in the cause of the United Nations the skilled labor of British workmen, British power capacity, and British industrial plants which can turn out shells and bombs to strike at Germany and Japan. By sending canning equipment and tin plate to Australia and New Zealand, we enable those countries to turn out great quantities of food which are furnished to our armed forces in the South and Southwest Pacific as reverse lend-lease.

Foodstuffs for soldiers and war workers have made up 12½ percent of our lend-lease aid. By March 1, 1944, we had sent to Russia 2,600,000 tons of food needed to maintain Soviet Army rations—more than to any other theater. These shipments have been necessary to replace the produce from the Ukraine, Russia's richest agricultural region, which was overrun by the Nazis. Now that the Ukraine has been liberated after more than 2 years of occupation we have sent 13,000 tons of seeds to assist the farmers of the U. S. S. R. replant the devastated lands.

Most of the rest of our lend-lease food shipments have gone to Britain to help feed her soldiers and war workers. These shipments constitute a vital 10 percent of the food consumed by Britain. Britain has always been dependent on imports for a large portion of her food. But by plowing up lawns, parks, and playing fields she has been able to increase food production to 70 percent over pre-war levels. Part of this increase she shares with us. Our forces stationed in Britain receive as reverse lend-lease 20 percent of the food they consume.

Each piece of military equipment, each piece of war-production material, and each ounce of foodstuff sent under lend-lease is for but one purpose—to enable our allies to strike harder blows against our common enemies. Our allies are now striking hard blows with us against our common enemies. On every battlefield in the world—the British whose bombers are nightly destroying the roof over Hitler's European fortress, while our Eighth and Ninth Air Forces do likewise by day; the Russians, whose armies have crossed the borders of Rumania and Czechoslovakia and are pushing on toward the centers of Nazi resistance; the Australians, British, Canadians, French, Greeks, Indians, New Zealanders, Poles, and Yugoslavs, who have fought shoulder to shoulder with us in the truly combined operations in the Mediterranean and Italy; the Australians, the Dutch and the New Zealanders, who are advancing with us on the islands and the seas of the South and Southwest Pacific; the British, the Chinese, and the Indians, who are now fighting with us in the jungles of Burma; and the Chinese, who are fighting with us in China to carry the war to the center of Japanese power.

All of our allies are putting everything they have into this war. Each has equipped its armies principally from its own resources. And each is turning over to us as reverse lend-lease as many supplies and services as it is in a position to do. From the British Commonwealth we had by January 1, 1944, received supplies and services valued at \$2,000,000,000, and we are currently receiving reverse lend-lease from them at the rate of \$2,000,000,000 a year. Our armed forces in Britain receive without cost to us one-third of their supplies currently required by them. The monthly rate of reverse lend-lease from Australia and New Zealand is now almost equal to the rate of lend-lease aid to them. Even French North and West Africa, whose territories have only so recently been liberated, have turned over to us supplies and services valued at \$30,000,000.

The Chinese and the Russians have not been in a position to supply us with reverse lend-lease in such substantial volume. But no one can say of them that they are not doing their part. Certainly not the Chinese, who have now been fighting the Japanese on their own land for nearly 7 years. Certainly not the Russians, who have now driven the Nazis almost completely out of their country, destroying millions of German soldiers as well as tens of thousands of German planes, tanks, and guns in the process. Each German or Japanese soldier or piece of equipment destroyed by our allies means that much less opposition for our American forces to face.

The victories that the United Nations have so far achieved have been based upon the pooling of resources through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. The United Nations are now fast approaching the crucial hour. The men of the United Nations and their matériel are deployed to strike new and greater blows both in Europe and in the Far East. The plans

for these new offensives are based upon the freest interchange of fighting manpower and fighting equipment. The first will be achieved through unity of command. The second through lend-lease and reverse lend-lease. It is absolutely vital that nothing be done at this critical stage of the war to disrupt these plans. The Lend-Lease Act must be extended.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday a question was asked with reference to the distribution of lend-lease food in the United Kingdom. I have received a statement, Mr. Chairman, which defines and explains everything with reference to this matter. The statement is as follows:

THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEND-LEASE FOOD IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

A considerable portion of the food supplied to the United Kingdom under lend-lease is not sold but is made directly available for consumption by the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of Britain. Another part of the food is distributed free of charge to needy school children, pregnant women, the crippled and destitute. The balance is sold for sterling by the United Kingdom Government through the regular channels of distribution to wholesalers who in turn sell through regular retailers but under controls and at prices which are rigidly controlled to prevent unequal distribution and profiteering.

The distribution of lend-lease food in any other manner would not be feasible. About 10 percent of Britain's food requirements is obtained through lend-lease. The remainder is grown at home or imported from the dominions and colonies. To segregate lend-lease food and distribute it through separate channels would require a new system of distribution which would waste manpower, would inevitably lead to great confusion in the pricing system, and would thus interfere with the prosecution of the war.

The proceeds from the sale of that part of the lend-lease food that is distributed through the regular distribution channels are, of course, received in sterling and not in dollars. These proceeds are retained by the United Kingdom Government and are not turned over to us. In view of the really tremendous volume of supplies and services we are receiving as reverse lend-lease, we have little present need for pounds sterling to purchase supplies and services in British territory.

Retention of the proceeds does not result in a double benefit to the United Kingdom. From the fiscal standpoint, the effect of the transaction is to reduce the amount of money the British Treasury has to raise by taxation or borrowing. The sterling receipts of the United Kingdom Government cannot, for example, be used to buy supplies in the United States. Since this is an internal matter, the only benefit to the British Government and therefore, to the British people, is that goods for the prosecution of the war are provided that otherwise would not be available. This is the benefit intended by the Lend-Lease Act. It's the same benefit whether the lend-lease goods are consumed directly by the Government as in the case of food consumed by the armed forces or of food sold through commercial channels for the use of war workers.

I should like to add, however, that the United States similarly retains the proceeds from the sale of reverse lend-lease goods. The dollars we receive, for example, from the sale of Ceylon rubber or tea obtained under reverse lend-lease, are retained by the United States and are not turned over to the British. The British are now supplying us as reverse

lend-lease for importation into the United States certain raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs heretofore purchased in the United Kingdom and colonies for cash. When these commodities arrived in the United States, our Government sells them through ordinary commercial channels and deposits the proceeds in the Treasury.

This question of the sale of lend-lease food by the British has been considered many times by your committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations both last year and this year. In its report last year to the Senate recommending the extension of the Lend-Lease Act, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations said:

"Some discussion was had as to the methods employed in distributing lend-lease food in Great Britain. The committee was advised that sale of the food through ordinary commercial channels was the most practical and efficient way to distribute it, and that transfer of sterling proceeds of that sale to the United States would be undesirable, in view of the over-all exchange problem, and the impressive volume of lend-lease in reverse we are receiving. It seems clear, however, that due account can be taken of whatever benefit accrues to the United Kingdom Government in consequence of this transaction in any final reckoning of the costs to the United Kingdom Government of the lend-lease-in-reverse program."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall take the time given me now to discuss an amendment that has been placed upon the Clerk's desk and which I shall submit when the bill reaches the point at which such an amendment is properly in order.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to modify the existing law and require that all final settlements of lend-lease transactions from the date of this enactment be subject to the approval of Congress.

The amendment contains a provision whereby all duties and obligations arising out of or in connection with existing agreements shall in no manner whatsoever be affected by the passage of this amendment. This amendment would not, in any manner whatsoever, impair the effectiveness of present lend-lease operations between the contracting nations under present lend-lease agreements. If, however, any of the existing agreements were to be amended or in any respect modified whereby the provisions or terms would be liberalized, the additional benefits granted, as the result of such modification, would be subject to review and approval by Congress. The existing act contains the following language:

The terms and conditions upon which any foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection A shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Under the provision of this act, the President has the absolute right to completely forgive each and every obligation or debt arising out of or in connection with any and all lend-lease transactions. This is admitted by all who have care-

fully read the act, and the President recognizes that he possesses such authority.

In the preliminary print of the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease appropriation, dated August 25, 1943, the President, in his initial letter of transmittal, said:

The Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

This statement brought forth considerable criticism and in the official letter of transmittal, submitted to the Congress with the eleventh report, that language was deleted.

I cannot conceive that it was the intention of Congress in enacting the lend-lease law to vest the President of the United States, whomever he may be, with the absolute authority to completely discharge every receiving nation of every obligation and debt arising in connection with the operation and extension of lend-lease property and money. It undoubtedly was the intention of Congress to grant broad powers to the President to administer such law and to grant lend-lease benefits where it could be of direct benefit in the winning of the war. I do not believe it was the intention of Congress that lend-lease benefits would be granted that would be of an economic or political benefit and extend beyond the duration of the war. The Lend-Lease Act was enacted into law prior to our military participation in the war. It was approved March 11, 1941. Our active military participation began 9 months later. A number of lend-lease agreements have been entered into with substantially all of the United Nations. Certain master agreements have been entered into. The terms and conditions of the master agreements which have been the subject of controversy, especially the commitments made in article 7 of the master agreements with Russia and Great Britain. Article 7 is in the following language:

ARTICLE VII

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of worldwide economic relations. To that end they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic

principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date conversations shall be begun between the two governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments.

In addition to the agreements made public, certain secret agreements have been entered into for the extension of lend-lease benefits. The terms and conditions of these secret agreements are unknown to the Members of Congress. It is reported that some 15 or more secret agreements exist. I have no knowledge of the contents of these agreements. I do know, however, that some of such agreements contain provisions that are distinctly beneficial to the other contracting nations. This information was given to the Foreign Affairs Committee, in executive session, and under the rules of the committee and of the House I am not permitted to disclose the information which I have regarding the distinct advantages that accrue to the favored nations, under the terms of these secret agreements. I believe I am privileged to say that such agreements are in the main with South American countries.

The proposed amendment is designed to vest in the Congress, and very properly so, concurrent control with the President in the making of final settlements upon lend-lease transactions originating from this date henceforth. It does not attempt to modify in any respect whatsoever any of the existing agreements or to vitiate or impair any of the obligations and duties now existing by virtue of lawfully heretofore executed agreements. It does not prevent the making of new agreements. It will, however, prevent clauses in such agreements whereby the assets transferred by lend-lease or debts or obligations thus created can be completely forgiven without the approval of Congress. In the end, Congress may well approve such and grant such complete forgiveness. That is a matter for the Congress to determine when such proposals for settlements are submitted to the Congress.

It has been suggested that this would result in endless controversy and that Congress would be met with a tremendous responsibility. This is the duty of Congress under the Constitution of the United States. The necessity for the amendment is made apparent at this time by the desire of nations securing lend-lease benefits to amend and modify the existing agreements. New Zealand, Australia, and especially Great Britain are seeking discussions having for their object the modification of the existing agreements, and particularly a modification that would permit lend-lease materials to be used for reexport and for the sustaining of the economy of the contracting nations. This amendment will not, in any manner whatsoever, impair the effectiveness and efficiency of our war effort, or of the war effort of our active cobelligerents. It will, I trust, protect

with reasonable degree the rights and property of our Government in the final settlement that would be made of all lend-lease accounts. Each year lend-lease has been reviewed and without modification renewed. This process of review has consisted largely of an appraisal and stock taking of the whole lend-lease operations. When it is realized that there has been made available for lend-lease a colossal fund that now approximates \$63,000,000,000 it is imperative that this Congress look carefully into this matter at this time and to the present status of lend-lease, as well as its future operations and of its effect upon the post-war economy of this Nation.

The direct appropriations for lend-lease to date amount to \$24,833,629,000. In addition, transfers are authorized from other appropriations in the amount of \$35,970,000,000, and in addition Congress has authorized the leasing of ships with funds appropriated to the Maritime Commission without numerical limitation as to the dollar value or the number of such ships so leased, but which accounts also exceed \$2,000,000,000, or a grand total of more than \$63,000,000,000 and which is now available or subject to disbursement under the administration of lend-lease. This represents more than one-fifth of the total wealth of our Nation and nearly one-half the current national income. This money does not belong to the President; neither does it belong to the Congress. It belongs to the Government of the United States and is derived by the payment of taxes by the citizens of this Nation. The right and duty to levy taxes is constitutionally conferred upon the Congress, as is also the duty and responsibility of disbursing the funds thus obtained from the taxpayers of this Nation. To confer upon any single individual the right to arbitrarily deal with this stupendous sum of money, without a check or the approval of the Congress, as the direct representative of the people, who supply such, is, in my judgment, absolutely contrary to the will of our citizens.

This amendment is not personal in the sense that it would restrict President Roosevelt only. It would be equally and just as forcibly applicable to any President, whoever he may be and of whatever political party. It is not American in principle, nor does it follow the principles of our Government to grant such broad powers, which, in my judgment, are in contravention of the Constitution, and I believe that Congress ignores the intent of the Constitution by delegating such authority.

Arguments will be made that the committee amendment submitted by Mr. WADSWORTH is sufficiently restrictive. A careful reading of this amendment will clearly disclose that it does not reach the objective sought to be reached by the present amendment. It does not touch upon the question of approval of acts performed by the President under authority of the Lend-Lease Act, and which are exclusively embraced in executive agreements, and do not require congressional approval. It merely pro-

hibits the President from making a commitment that would create an obligation affecting our post-war economic or post-war military policy which would be restrictive only of the things undertaken to be done in article 7 of the master agreements, and would in no sense whatsoever require congressional approval of acts done under the Lend-Lease Act for final settlement of the lend-lease accounts as between the United States and other contracting parties.

The necessity for such amendment at this time becomes apparent by reason of the attitude of our allies, some of whom are seeking a modification of the lend-lease agreements. I wish to call your attention to an Associated Press dispatch dated March 15, 1944, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN TRY TO CLARIFY FUTURE OF LEASE-LEND SET-UP

LONDON, March 15.—A determined effort to reach an accord on several basic problems of lease-lend—an issue of mounting importance in British-American relations—is understood to be in progress to clarify the present and future economic position of both Britain and the United States.

The first objective probably will be a clearer understanding of the scope of British industrial exports at a time when this island nation is dependent on a life line from America for huge quantities of goods.

DIVISION OF PRODUCTION

The crux of the situation is how much of Britain's industrial capacity should be used for export production, how much is needed to maintain a war-pared trade minimum, and how to settle problems arising from the shift in shipping supremacy from Britain to America.

It is understood in London that rough drafts of a proposed agreement on one or more of these entwined questions had been drawn and then discarded after conferences in Washington. It is sure to be near the top of the agenda for coming discussions between Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., American Under Secretary of State and British officials.

Although the export problem alone is far reaching in its economic implications, it is just one of several which will tax the diplomatic, industrial, and trade brains of both nations in order to preserve the amity born of wartime partnership.

POST-WAR SHIPPING PROBLEMS

Other questions attracting mounting attention include—

1. Will there be post-war shipping pool by the two nations with a division of markets, or will there be out-and-out competition? What will be the position of smaller shipping nations such as the Dutch? Should an accord be reached now on subsidized shipping and tariffs?

2. What arrangements should be made now to dispose of the huge quantities of war materials—such as clothing and motor vehicles—to civilian use after victory without duplicating the chaotic market conditions that prevailed after the last war? What, for example, should be done with surplus machine tools to prevent a long shut-down in industry?

Both the British and Americans are approaching these and related issues with an increasing realization of their gravity, a growing desire to get them out of the way as the military situation brightens and gradual recognition of the political implications a solution holds for each other.

I also want to call your attention to another very important subject reported in

the New York Times, April 16, 1944, and which I quote as follows:

Publication of British dollar accumulations, it was added, is opposed by our own Government officials because it might "furnish a weapon" to some legislators who urge curtailment of lend-lease aid without considering the future consequences of such an action. The new arrangement announced Friday, when approved, it was held, would constitute a "reasonable approach" to the use of British held dollars.

FIVE BILLION CREDIT URGED

However, it was argued, in order to lay plans in accord with the vague terms of the Atlantic Charter, Britain must be heavily backed by gold, possibly along the lines recently suggested by Leon Fraser, president of the First National Bank, of New York, who urged extension of a credit of \$5,000,000,000, formal cancellation of the balance of British war debts of World War No. 1, and a 5-year moratorium on lend-lease repayments. The extension of such a credit would be predicated on an agreement that neither nation would engage in competitive exchange depreciation.

The extension of such a credit by private banks, it was pointed out, is prevented by the Johnson Act of 1934, which prohibits any group but a Government corporation to float loans for a country which still has an unpaid balance from debts resulting from the last war. No Government corporation has seriously indicated a willingness to make such a commitment and Congress has not paid attention to the problem.

Endorsing this reasoning by traders, Wilbert Ward, vice president of the National City Bank, of New York, and president of the Bankers Association for Foreign Trade, yesterday stated that he agreed "Britain is in a hot spot." British representatives who have visited the United States have not been able to return to Britain and report to that country's authorities "on what support they could count upon from this country," he declared.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. From the gentleman's speech I take it he would admit that the original Lend-Lease Act provided that we should not receive any pay whatever for any of the lend-lease products or goods furnished to any Allies; is that right?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I take it from the language of the act that the right to forgive all debts and obligations is completely vested in the President.

Mr. ELMER. That certainly is the law; is it not?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Correct.

Mr. ELMER. And that has been the law up to the present time; is that correct?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

Mr. ELMER. And the commitments and contracts have been made with the Allies under that law?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is right.

Mr. ELMER. How are you going to amend the act so as to change the obligations of the contracts that have been entered into between the United States and other nations?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The language of the amendment itself cares for that without impairing our obligations under existing agreements.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman is a lawyer; is he not?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes.

Mr. ELMER. Can you change a contract by action on the part of one party to a contract?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No; but if the gentleman will permit me to read the language of the amendment he will find that it properly cares for such situation.

Mr. ELMER. Can you change it by amendment?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. We are not attempting to do so by amendment.

Mr. ELMER. Can you?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Let me answer your question, please.

Mr. ELMER. Then you can require these people to settle for all the goods they have received as a gift, is that right?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. If the gentleman will permit me to read the amendment I will try to inform him as what it contains with respect to that particular provision.

Mr. ELMER. I do not care what it contains. The question is whether you can do that, no matter what it contains.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The language of the amendment reads:

Provided, however, That all duties and obligations heretofore lawfully created and arising out of or in connection with all existing contracts or agreements, shall in no manner whatsoever be impaired or vitiated by this act.

Mr. ELMER. Then the gentleman recognizes that the contracts exist and we cannot change them, and all the goods that have been delivered cannot be reached or touched by this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No.

Mr. ELMER. The only thing is that in the future they may agree to modify previous contracts, and that is the only way you can reach it, with or without your amendment.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No; I think not. I think the amendment provides in the final settlement any benefits would subject to being submitted to the Congress for its approval before such settlements became final.

Mr. ELMER. If we have given several billion dollars and received reverse lend-lease from these people and there is a balance due us, according to the gentleman's computation now, how are we going to get it without their consent, without their modifying their contracts with us?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I cannot say that those are the terms of the contracts. I believe whatever those terms are they should come back to this Congress for approval.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman understands, does he not, that if he and I make a contract I cannot change that contract without his consent?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Positively. I recognize that to be the law.

Mr. ELMER. Then how can the Congress change those contracts without the consent of the other parties?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. We are not doing that in existing contracts but only those made in the future.

Mr. ELMER. Then it applies only to lend-lease going out of here in the future?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Precisely.

Mr. ELMER. All right. Let us get it clear in the Record.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is a contract valid or binding that is a one-way affair?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is rather a moot question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask the gentleman as a layman. This lend-lease is all going out and nothing coming back.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. What this amendment proposes to do is to put back into this Congress, where I think it properly belongs, the right to say definitely what will become of the American taxpayer's dollar, whether it shall be forgiven or not be forgiven.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Missouri expounds a very interesting doctrine when he talks about a contract between the United States and some bankrupt nation that is just getting and getting and giving nothing in return. It would be terrible if that contract were vitiated.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If we attempt by amendment now to interfere with what was an agreed contract and it applied to the whole Lend-Lease Act and not any part thereof, just how effective would your amendment be?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I will answer that in this way, that the Wadsworth amendment which came in and is a part of the committee print of the bill, is an attempt to repudiate a contract entered into in the master agreements in article VII. If you will read article VII of the master agreements, there are international commitments made as to which the Wadsworth amendment, part of the committee print, now requires that before the acts intended to be done under article VII shall be done, it shall be done in accordance with constitutional procedure.

Mr. ROWE. If I may proceed with this one further question, am I to believe that the Wadsworth amendment now is an admission that we did sign a complete contract at first, and we are now saying we do not want to agree to what we agreed to at that time?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The Wadsworth amendment in effect puts the brakes on what was done in article VII of the master agreement, and now gives that authority back to the Congress.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the author of the amendment, when he spoke

yesterday, said, I believe, that he did not think that lend-lease gave any authority to the Government to make any post-war commitments, but he just wanted to make it doubly sure by having it expressly contained in the act lest some person might take that authority from the Lend-Lease Act. I do not know whether I am quoting the gentleman correctly or not. He is here and he can correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Irrespective of that, the Wadsworth amendment goes directly to the text of article VII of the master agreement, where certain commitments have been made with respect to post-war conduct on the part of the United States.

Mr. ELMER. What did the gentleman mean a while ago when he talked about constitutional processes?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is contained in the Wadsworth amendment.

Mr. ELMER. What does the gentleman mean by "constitutional processes"?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is a rather difficult question for me to answer. I assume it relates only to those contracts which rise to the dignity of a treaty and not those that are within the category of executive agreements.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With that I cannot agree. I think it covers executive agreements.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman not think that these contracts ought to be definite and certain so that anybody who reads them can understand them?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ELMER. If you draw a contract for your client, that is the way you try to make it.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

Mr. ELMER. Is not that the way the gentleman would make it?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Of course.

Mr. ELMER. Does the gentleman not think these contracts that he has been talking about with other governments are on the basis of what the President may think and how he may construe those contracts later on?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think the power and authority is given him under the act to construe them in any way he desires.

Mr. ELMER. All right.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. It has been suggested that this would result in endless controversy and that Congress in attempting to settle final accounts would assume a responsibility that it was incapable of discharging. That is a duty of the Congress. It is not to be assumed that any representative of this body is going out into the field to check whatever may be left in foreign countries of the supplies shipped there under lend-lease. We are to have submitted to us in written form a statement of what remains there under lend-lease and is to be returned to this country. We are then to determine whether or not that shall be forgiven. For instance, we supplied entire plants and have shipped entire plants to Russia. In 1 year we shipped over 600,000 miles of copper wire. We cannot recover that. It would likely be the better plan to abandon such and to forget it.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I note in article V of one of the master agreements this language:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency—

That is what I want to accentuate—

at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles—

And so forth. That refers to the end of the present emergency as decided by the President. What would occur in the event any one country of the United Nations should desire to make a separate peace with the common enemy? That would not terminate the present emergency except as to the country making the separate peace. What would happen as to the lend-lease or defense articles in the hands of that country, and would that stop any further shipments? Is there any understanding about that in either the master agreements or in the act itself?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I know of nothing in the master agreements. I think the act itself would cover it. It would be entirely discretionary with the President as to what would happen to the residue of any lend-lease property in that country.

Mr. DEWEY. Naturally, I agree with that, because the President has complete authority to lend-lease or do anything he pleases with any of these articles under any terms; but does not the gentleman think it might be advisable to give the Congress some power to express itself on a matter as important as that?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. In my judgment, if there were a settlement made with that country, under the amendment I am proposing that settlement would be subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. DEWEY. True enough; but I am seeking to have a definite stop in case some country should make a separate peace. In that event, I think it would probably be advisable to have all use of lend-lease stopped and all further shipments stopped.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think under the terms of the act that automatically would occur.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not very important to have my amendment incorporated in the bill, which would provide that before any final settlement under lend-lease should be made it would come back for the Congress to act on under concurrent resolution?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes; I think so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would be an added protection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think the gentleman's proposed amendment accomplishes something that neither the Wad-

worth amendment nor the amendment which I propose accomplishes. The Wadsworth amendment is directed to a certain objective, and I think a very sound one. I think the gentleman's amendment is proposed to reach another situation, and is also sound.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think possibly the Wadsworth amendment could take care of the amendment I have in mind, but I want to make sure.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I doubt very much that it does.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If we had a military alliance it would not, would it?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to attempt to address myself as best I can to the Schiffer amendment and the Wadsworth amendment.

There was considerable discussion in committee as to the function of Congress in any post-war settlement that might be made with reference to lend-lease. My colleague from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] is an able lawyer. I am afraid he has approached this matter too much from the standpoint of a lawyer and possibly is neglecting some very practical considerations which might bear upon the wisdom of his amendment and upon the House's decision as to whether or not it should be adopted.

To me this is not a partisan matter, and it is not to him. I think we are both eager, and I think all the Members of the House are eager, to see that the prerogatives of the House are insisted upon, that there shall be no bypassing of the proper functions of Congress either in the war or in the peace.

Lend-lease articles and services are extended to our allies for the purpose of the mutual prosecution of the war. It is not a debtor-creditor relationship. We make a great mistake if we consider the people who are the recipients of lend-lease as our debtors. We are putting guns into their hands from the practical point of view that they can better assist us with those guns than possibly we could if we fired them ourselves.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I do not believe the gentleman will find any particular objection to the allocation of guns or munitions or implements of war on either side in the administration of lend-lease. It is the varied other activities that have brought about the criticism.

Mr. WRIGHT. To what is the gentleman referring? He is going to have to be a little more specific if I am to answer him.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Forty nations are participating, but only 12 of them are fighting.

Mr. WRIGHT. The objection of the gentleman was discussed and, I believe, answered yesterday. I should like to proceed with the thought I have, and if I have any time later I shall be glad to attempt to answer the gentleman.

I may say that the bulk of lend-lease is going to the nations that are doing the actual fighting. The major part of lend-lease is going to Russia and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

What is going to happen after the war is over? You are going to have military equipment, some agricultural equipment, some manufacturing equipment, and undoubtedly some transportation equipment all over the world. It is going to add up to a great amount of money. Also, there will be a great number and variety of items in various places all over the world, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] suggested yesterday. The question will arise as to what to do, for instance, with a certain number of small arms in Russia or in one of the islands adjacent to Australia, and he suggested very properly the decision should be made by the military commanders in the field.

Otherwise you are going to put upon the Congress an almost impossible job of accounting. As I said before, the fundamental error is that the gentleman from West Virginia is considering the relation between these countries as the relationship between debtor and creditor, a business relationship, and is treating lend-lease as a commercial debt whose payment must be enforced. Remember also that the master agreements provide that all of the equipment which is not used or not consumed remains the property of the United States. If it is to our interest to secure its return, we have the legal right to do so.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; I will yield, although I was trying to develop a point.

Mr. ELMER. If at the close of the war or at the end of any emergency or at anytime we were to have, as we have at this stage of the game, about \$5,000,000,000 worth of equipment in Russia, which consists of 8,300 airplanes, 220,000 vehicles, 200 locomotives, and 3,000 freight cars, how are you going to get it back?

Mr. WRIGHT. I maintain it is going to be impossible physically to get most of it back, and it would probably be to the financial detriment of this country if we did, if we loaded up the country and glutted our markets with a lot of equipment that was made for war purposes. It would be better economically if we scrapped it or permitted our allies the continued use of it. That is a decision which should be made at that time.

Mr. ELMER. Then you mean, if we give away everything we have, we would be in better shape than if we kept it?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; better off than if we try to get back the war materials and try to use them for peace purposes. I do not want to go into that question too far, because that is a decision we do not have to make at this time. It is a decision that should be made at a later date.

Mr. ELMER. If all of this material is in Russia, could you get that down into an area near Japan so that it would help us out?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is what I hope and what we all hope—that Russia will continue to use the material to help us.

Mr. ELMER. How are you going to do it without Russia's consent?

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, it must be used with their consent. It would be a much better use for us if the Russians used the very same weapons and guns and their men against the Japanese. That is what every person in Congress hopes and every person in America, I am quite sure of that.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Stimson testified, according to the report here, that he would not know how it could be done. Do you know of anybody who does?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know of anybody. Does the gentleman know anybody?

Mr. ELMER. No; that is what I am kicking about. They will keep it. You know they will keep it. They will never return a nickel of it to us.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not have the gift of prophecy. I do not know what is going to happen in the future. However, I am addressing myself to this particular amendment.

Mr. ELMER. In my opinion, there is no nation on the face of this earth that in their own interest would not cut the throat of the United States if they got the chance.

Mr. VRIGHT. I think the gentleman is possibly a little pessimistic.

Mr. ELMER. That is what you may think. That is what I think.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think that remark is very unfair. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not think that remark should be carried in the RECORD. I wish that the gentleman would kindly withdraw it. It is a very serious allegation to say that they would cut our throat.

Mr. ELMER. That is what I think about it.

Mr. BLOOM. I think it is very unfair. They are our allies and we should treat them as allies. I do not think the gentleman means that statement should remain in the RECORD.

Mr. ELMER. We have not any allies. They are United Nations or associates. That is what they are called.

Mr. BLOOM. We are allies; we are fighting together to win this war. I think any representations or any statements made against our allies should be in other terms than as stated by the gentleman. I hope that before the RECORD goes to print tonight the gentleman will reconsider his remarks and withdraw them from the RECORD.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman from New York will change his mind at the close of the war. You will see if you do not.

Mr. BLOOM. What I am saying is in all fairness to our allies.

Mr. ELMER. I am not going to do it because that is what I believe.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I regret the gentleman's statement. It is most unfair, unjust, and most regrettable, particularly at this time when complete cooperation and mutual trust are so essential in winning the war.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is another objection to the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia which I think is basic. I want you to consider for a moment the power that is exercised by the leaders of our allies, due to their forms of government, which are different than ours. The central Russian Government undoubtedly does not have to go to the legislative body to get consent for every business transaction that has to do with the joint waging of the war. Under the British parliamentary system the Prime Minister speaks for the Parliament. The Prime Minister acts for Parliament. He is their agent, you might say. He has power to speak for England and to make agreements for England. In the beginning of this war, even before the war started, we felt that it was better in order to insure flexibility and efficiency of military operation, to give the President great powers so that he would not be hampered in the proper conduct of the war. I personally do not think, and I do not believe that the Members of Congress think, that this is a time to change the rules of the game. If we do we are going to greatly handicap our President, acting through our military leaders. All of us have confidence in our military leaders. I believe that all of us have confidence in our President, in his patriotism, and in his sincere efforts to further the interests of this country. It is not a good idea to hamper the executive arm of the Government, acting through our military at the present time by imposing a condition subsequent upon any agreement which might be made with reference to lend-lease.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It seems to me, as to these future agreements the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER], or some such amendment, merely states the facts of the case. There is not any way in which the Congress can constitutionally hamper the President in making military agreements and executive agreements which are within his power, even if it tried to.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On the other hand, the nations abroad are fully conscious of President Wilson's 14 points and the Treaty of Versailles and what happened afterward. The fact is that the President of the United States, whoever he may be, cannot make an agreement that other countries will rely upon unless it is backed up by the Congress. So that when we write into the fundamental law the fact that future agreements must be approved by the Congress, all we are doing is writing in what is needed in order for the President to negotiate effectively with other nations.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman has brought that point up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to make a distinction at this time as to the type of agreement under the lend-lease authority which has antecedent legislative approval and needs no further legislative action. By lend-lease we empower the President, the Lend Lease Administration, to make agreements which are binding without any subsequent approval by Congress. We understand that. I think for the purpose of making war that is the only efficient way of doing it.

But I am also thankful that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], with his usual statesmanlike approach, proposed the amendment which he did, because, if I can make the distinction, and I would like to make it clear, when we come into post-war agreements and post-war planning and post-war relations among the nations, Congress should definitely have a hand, as the Constitution provides that it should. What does the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] provide? It does not attempt to hamper our military forces or Lend-Lease Administration in making agreements with other nations, insofar as the supplying of arms and the necessary material of war is concerned. It does not in anyway interfere with the conduct of the war, but once the war is over it prevents any agreement looking beyond the war. It says, in effect to the Executive, "Stop, you cannot commit this country to any settlement as to lend-lease which is going to impose a post-war obligation upon the country unless you go to the Senate, in the case of a treaty, or unless you seek the approval of both Houses, in the case of an Executive agreement." So consequently there is this distinction between the amendments. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] ought to be defeated because I believe it will hamper our military and hamper our Lend-Lease Administration. It will impose new conditions upon lend-lease agreements and thus tie the hands of the administration. It will create an uncertainty in the minds of the nations with whom we make agreements as to whether or not the Congress is finally going to approve a settlement of their accounts. On the other hand we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] because it asserts the prerogative of Congress in dealing with post-war military relations and post-war business relations. I realize the nations of Europe at the present time recognize the fact that after the last war the division between the Executive and the Senate did very much to wreck the peace.

I am just as anxious as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] that we do not have a repetition of that. I think the Wadsworth amendment tends to remove that chance, or at least make it less probable.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. By "the Wadsworth amendment" the gentleman means the committee amendment which was offered in the committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and which was unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Does the gentleman contend that it was the intention of the Congress when it originally enacted lend-lease that lend-lease goods should be shipped to the receiving countries and be resold by those countries and the proceeds put into the exchequers of the countries receiving lend-lease aid and utilized for general governmental purposes of those nations?

Mr. WRIGHT. No; I do not.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. This amendment is precisely the thing that is intended to check that practice.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is not necessary that the gentleman's amendment be passed. There is at present an agreement, as I understand it, between the nations that there shall be no lend-lease goods exported. Even under the terms of our master agreement they have no right to do it, because the title to the goods remains in us.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. That is not the case according to the statement of Mr. Stettinius himself in reply to questions before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year in which he admitted that the food shipped to Great Britain was being received and sold for cash by the British Government.

Mr. WRIGHT. To the British people.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. By the British Government to the British people and that the funds went into the exchequer and it went for the production of supplies to carry on the war. It might be used for the payment of troops or the building of a battleship or the repairing of a cruiser or buying potatoes or any other purpose. Does the gentleman contend that it was the intention of the Congress that it was to be utilized for such purposes?

Mr. WRIGHT. Perhaps we did not intend that, but I do not think the situation is as bad as the gentleman paints it. That is a relation between the British Government and their own people. The food is purchased by the Government.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I am speaking of lend-lease funds.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, but whether they raise the goods on their own land or buy it from some other source, or whether they get it from lend-lease is immaterial. I understand the way they handled their food distribution, most of it is purchased by a central authority and then put on the market. In some cases it is given to the people and in some cases it is sold to the people. Our relations are with Great Britain. If Great Britain should sell lend-lease goods abroad, we would

have a kick coming. But the way they handle their own food distribution is not a matter that is as grave as might be suggested by the gentleman nor a matter which is particularly our concern.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is pertinent to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] if Great Britain did not dispose of those goods to its civilian population by sale, would the gentleman prefer that Great Britain just gave it out free, without charging anything for it, not get anything into the exchequer? Or would the gentleman have them set up a system over there, by which they sell the goods directly to the people? You have to dispose of them some way. And the only way to dispose of them is by sale. It is much better than giving them away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. In answer to that inquiry—

Mr. WRIGHT. May I take the 1 minute, please? To amplify what my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said the British Government is being charged a running account of lend-lease, with that food. If it would give the foods to its people it would have no means of paying for the food eventually. It is either a question of the British Government being charged for the food or of the people of Great Britain paying for it directly to us, which would be an indescribably confused situation. This matter was brought up last year. As I say, I do not think it is as bad as the gentleman would suggest. It does not compare to the shipment of goods to another country by a recipient of lend-lease which would amount to obtaining merchandise by credit from us, and selling for cash abroad, and to which I think we have a definite right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and that I be not interrupted during the course of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska that he may speak out of order?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of interest has been stirred by the fact that I have seen fit to release for publication some correspondence I have had with General MacArthur. Because of that interest I feel it my duty to explain my reasons for thus disclosing my support of the general for the Republican nomination for the Pres-

idency. As a humble Member of Congress and of the Republican Party, I felt it my duty to settle in my own mind the question of who would be the most outstanding and experienced man that the party could nominate. In going about this work I made it a point to see and talk to the men who were being prominently mentioned for President and to gain whatever other information I could about them. Since I could not talk to General MacArthur I studied his record and talked with those who knew him. Then I wrote him and received courteous replies. I made the correspondence public, and all of you now know its contents.

There are some people greatly concerned over the release of these letters for publication. I did this on my own initiative. I did not consult the general. In my opinion the general in no way was entirely agreeing with me in my criticism of the New Deal. Criticizing this administration is my privilege and duty. If the columnists and the members of the majority party want a whipping boy they should use me. Personally, I feel that the publication of the letters has again thrust the general back into the interest of the public. The amount of publicity through the press and radio has been most amazing. A thousand fires have been started which eventually will have good results.

I have received some 300 letters and telephone calls. I would estimate that 10 percent of the letters were of the smear type—vicious, malignant, and unsigned. Some 15 percent ask questions, have doubts about MacArthur. Seventy-five percent are glowing with praise of the general and the possibility that he may be the next President and Commander in Chief of the armed forces. There are letters from church groups praising the general's humility and his belief in the Deity and his strong Christian statements. Others say, that an "experienced general in the White House will shorten the war." "MacArthur knows the Pacific warfare." "We may well fight the Japs single-handed." "MacArthur has built up defenses in the Pacific, knows that type of warfare." "Let's have an experienced soldier in the White House for one term to shorten the war." "The general knows diplomacy and foreign affairs." "He will deal with a firm hand at the peace table and with the Japs." "He will help write an American peace." "He will deal firmly with selfish blocs and groups seeking to destroy this country." All these letters have a ring of sincerity and seriousness. They are not from professional politicians but from the folks in the country who think in simple, honest terms. They want someone in the White House who will get the war over as quickly as possible and then write a just and a lasting peace. The letters represent the outpouring of the heart of America.

As a result of my study and these many letters I became convinced that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has the qualifications and experience to make a great President, and that the Republican Party should present his name to the people as its nominee. This is no reflec-

tion on the other outstanding men who are being mentioned.

The Republican Party has a number of outstanding statesmen who would undoubtedly make great Presidents. It is the duty of the delegates and those in the political saddle to select the individual who can give the best service. They should remember that the war is still on. There is no doubt but what General MacArthur has a tremendous national popularity. It is not based on sentiment, emotionalism, or hero worship, but rather upon the knowledge that he, above anyone else upon the horizon today, is better equipped to assume and fulfill the role of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and President of the United States. His popularity comes from a deep feeling that here is a man who could be entrusted with the task of bringing this war to a conclusion in the shortest time possible and in doing so would see to it that we would not "inadvertently slip into the same condition internally as the one which we fight externally."

It should be remembered that General MacArthur has already held the highest military office in the United States Army. He has served in three wars. He has served for a long time as Chief of Staff, and had General MacArthur's wishes and plans been listened to and followed in regard to fortifying the Philippines in the days when he was Chief of Staff, there might not now have been such a tragedy as Bataan and Corregidor. When President Roosevelt, through an unprecedented Executive order, continued him in office as Chief of Staff, he said:

It gives me great pleasure to promote so brilliant a soldier. I feel certain that General MacArthur will maintain the high standard set by eminent men who have preceded him as Chief of Staff.

General MacArthur knows how to get along with Congress.

The general had recently a most valuable experience in working with Admiral Halsey in the Pacific operations. This has given him an "on the job" knowledge of the use of combined Army, Navy, and military forces that is possessed by few other living men.

Is there anyone who can say that it is not most important at the moment, and for the months ahead, to have as President a man who by training, knowledge, and experience has such high qualities of Commander in Chief as is possessed by General MacArthur? It is a consensus of opinion that the war in Europe may be over early in 1945. We will then have the task of whipping the Japs. Who is better qualified to do that than General MacArthur? It does seem to me that any civilian nominee not having a military experience would undoubtedly be greatly handicapped. There are some people who would feel that continuing the New Deal would be the lesser of two evils rather than changing to some untried and inexperienced candidate.

A few of my letters have said in effect: "MacArthur is a fine general and is doing a good job in the Pacific, but what does he know about running the coun-

try?" It makes one wonder if a few of the citizens have become so conditioned in the past 12 years with the idea that one man, or the President, runs the country. The events of the past few months rather indicate that Congress and the Senate still function, and if General MacArthur were elected President, he would have the advice and counsel of men well qualified with experience in handling the internal affairs of the country.

The need now undoubtedly is for the office of President of the United States to function more as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy rather than to devote his time to internal domestic affairs. There are plenty of capable representatives of the people who can look after domestic affairs.

I do not believe that the average voter will be touched or stirred by high-pressure campaigning by either party. Their thinking follows simple, honest, and direct lines. They voted for Roosevelt for a third term, not because they necessarily liked him, but the world was approaching a war. They might vote for Roosevelt again unless a candidate of unusual qualifications with military experience is brought forth. The voters are stating quite simply that since we are at war few men know the situation as well as Roosevelt and that a new man, regardless of his fine qualifications, unless he had a knowledge of military affairs might make some mistake. I do feel, however, that there is a mass movement among the people who are dissatisfied with this administration's conduct of the war and the home-front operations. They will vote for a Republican. The next House of Representatives will be Republican. They do want outstanding military experience in the White House. Who, may I ask, knows more about the Pacific and how to fight the Japs than General MacArthur? The Republican Party has several fine candidates, but are they the right men for this election fight? Does not the average man feel that the next occupant of the White House should understand military operations and international maneuvers in order to avoid mistakes when he takes over the reigns of government?

It is my opinion that General MacArthur has every special qualification that would cause the average voter to put him in office. He has a tremendous national popularity. He is trusted by the people. He has humility and respect for the Deity. The average man will not need much selling to win his vote for MacArthur. He would well think that here is a man who comes home to help us do the things on the home front that will help our boys on the battle front.

The opposition would find little political ammunition in campaigning around the thought that he is not fully acquainted with the war in the Pacific or that he lacks knowledge of home-front problems.

After the war the big job will be that of making a just and lasting peace. Success in this undertaking will depend upon our relations with our allies while the

war is being won, and in our post-war negotiations. I do not think for 1 minute that General MacArthur is an isolationist. With his experience he must know that in order to assure peace in the world we must work with other countries. I am sure, however, that he is not imbued with the idea that it is our duty to make the world over according to the idealistic schemes of the social planners who dominate this administration, and who shout "isolationist" at everyone who disagrees with them. I am sure that he will do everything possible to help the other nations establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. He will strongly represent American ideals, but he will not attempt to meddle in affairs of other great nations and thus engender feelings that will lead to other wars. In carrying on our foreign relations I am sure he will be guided by an informed public opinion.

The other job that confronts the next President is the solution of our domestic problems. Our biggest domestic problem now is to bring about an unselfish and united effort to back up our armed forces. By its policy of favoring certain groups and opposing others the New Deal has divided this country into warring factions. Somebody is needed who can call all the people from their own interests and galvanize them into a united force. Again, I say, who could better do this than the man who has done so much with so little, who not only stopped the Japs short of Australia, but who drove them back even though his has been considered a secondary front. He is free from obligation to any faction of our people. He could talk to them in the words of our soldiers and sailors on the battle lines.

General MacArthur is a born leader of men. He has been fearless in his contacts and has been right in his judgments. He has a profound belief in the essential good judgment of the American people once they know the truth. He believes in constitutional government. By every standard he measures up to the high stature of the Presidency.

In conclusion, let me emphasize my previous statement, as to my motive in publishing this correspondence. I was moved by an intense desire and the need of the country and hoped the Republican Party would nominate a man who could win the election and who would be wholly competent to lead our country in this critical time to a quick victory and the writing of a lasting peace without this country losing some of the things which we are fighting to protect. I believe that in releasing this correspondence that it has focused the country's attention upon this critical need. I take full responsibility for my act and ask that criticisms for it be directed entirely at me. In the general's replies to me I did not, nor do I now consider that he endorsed in whole my criticism of the New Deal, although I feel that the general is gravely concerned with the way things are going in his beloved country. Other generals and high officials have felt free to express their concern. Every American has that right, or should have it. I did what I thought

was right. This may be politics and politics often does strange things but it has given the people a chance to think.

It is most necessary that the Republican Party will nominate a man of General MacArthur's ability and ideals and if they do they will be electing a great American as President of the United States.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of the exacting intellectual toil of this body in considering this very important legislation, I am sure we are grateful to the gentleman from Nebraska for injecting a one-man nomination convention at this point. I want to thank him for the relief and pleasure it has given me personally.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the situation as it exists in the Far East at the present time. I believe that this country, due to recent developments, has become more cognizant of the serious threat to our security that lies in that area. In order to comprehend the situation, we have to understand some of the factors affecting the different countries, located in that part of the world.

Even though Russia, in a military sense, is not engaged in the Pacific war, she is, nevertheless, in a position of considerable importance. Some of the American planes that are playing such a vital part in the defeat of Hitler on the Russian front have reached the Russian Army by way of Siberia. Other lend-lease supplies are still being shipped in by way of Vladivostok and are transported from that port by means of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, not only to the European front but perhaps also to possible fronts in Asia. The Russians still have a large concentration of troops on the Manchukuoan-Korean frontier and as long as that concentration remains where it is, so long will Japan have to divert some of its army and air force to that area for its own protection. On that basis some hundreds of thousands of Japanese troops are immobilized and that means that those troops cannot be used elsewhere.

There have been reports lately emanating from Chungking to the effect that a sizable portion of the Kwantung army has been dispatched from Manchukuo, its headquarters, for service in central China for a drive against Chungking, and also for service to southwest China for a possible drive against the American-trained Chinese divisions located north of Burma in the Chinese province of Yunnan. Just what this indicates is, of course, hard for a layman to know, but it would appear that Japan is girding itself in an effort to compensate for losses suffered in the Pacific at the hands of MacArthur, Halsey, and Nimitz. Japan does not have the naval power or the air power to stop us for long on any front that we desire to set up in the Pacific Ocean, but she does have a concentration of forces in China proper and perhaps elsewhere on the Asiatic Continent to strike telling blows. We cannot afford to become too sanguine about our Pa-

cific successes because there we have to fight not only the Japanese but space and time as well, and those two elements have been, and still are, on the side of the Japanese and they are allowing our enemies to consolidate their conquests and to exploit the resources in the conquered territories.

In their attempts to strike telling blows, to compensate for their Pacific losses to us, the Japanese have undertaken the invasion of India which to date, from their point of view, has been a very successful operation. It is not a matter of liberating India as far as the Japanese are concerned, nor do they consider seriously the setting up of a provisional government to administer the affairs of that sick country. Rather it seems to be a well-calculated and long-thought-out plan to break into certain parts of India, obtain some degree of control and use those parts of the country, specifically the state of Manipur, to cut China's heart by disrupting her supply route from Calcutta to Assam.

From a study of the map of east and northeast India it appears that the Japanese are striving to cut transportation on the Bengal-Assam railroad, which of course will mean, if they are successful, that the supply lines leading to the Ledo Road now being built by American and Chinese forces under Stilwell, will be cut off and it also means that the advance air fields in Assam from which supplies are flown into China will be rendered negligible from a transportation point of view. While the cutting of the Bengal-Assam railroad would not keep all supplies from going into China or north Burma it would diminish its effectiveness to such an extent that American transport planes would have to fly farther, carry more gas and smaller loads of vitally needed matériel. All our troops under Stilwell's command would be placed in a very hazardous position because they would have to be supplied by air and this is at best a difficult undertaking.

We know that for the past year and a half that Americans have been stationed in the high spots of the Himalayas and that those men located in those isolated areas have to be fed by parachute. All the material which would have to be sent in by air to China would be considerably less because of the necessity of feeding the Americans, and the Chinese carrying forward the work of opening the supply routes to China and subsequently would bring about a lessening in the flow of matériel needed to carry on the war in that area. The effect of this would undoubtedly be a long delay to the struggle in Asia and it might, if carried on long enough, bring about the loss of China in this war. Too often have we kept the Chinese alive on promises, and too often have the Chinese been let down only to bounce back again. There is a limit to a people's and a nation's endurance and the psychological effect of what Japan has been able to do in India has hurt our prestige with the Chinese and lowered their resistance to a dangerous degree. If the Japanese are successful in India and Burma, it is not too

much to assume that China with its internal weaknesses such as unchecked inflation and ideological conflict may be forced out of the war.

That is something that we must take into consideration all the time, that is one of the reasons why we must be aware of what is going on in the Far East and recognize the facts for what they are. I have taken as active an interest as I possibly could in our great ally China not so much because I like the Chinese people—and I do—but because I feel quite strongly that the more assistance we get into China and the greater use we can make of China's manpower the less difficult will be our part in the Pacific war and the more American lives we will save.

Our bombers have begun to make their presence felt in China, although in that theater we have not yet assumed the offensive. On the Asiatic mainland, time has, in one sense, been fighting on the side of the Celestial Empire. But time is a fickle ally. Potentially, China remains our most effective base for aerial operations against Japan.

Supply is our problem in China. To supply our growing air strength in that country has been perhaps the greatest single challenge to the efficiency of the air forces. Every item of equipment necessary for the maintenance and operation of our Fourteenth Air Force must be flown into China from the outside. That is the primary, fundamental fact of our present strategy in Asia.

It may throw some light to consider this fact in terms of gasoline alone. In the round trip over the hump between Assam and Kunming, the C-87 transport now in use can deliver 4 tons of 100-octane gasoline. To do so, the airplane must consume $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons of the same precious commodity.

The crews of a heavy bombardment group in China must ferry over their own gasoline, bombs, replacement parts and everything else in their own B-24's—the C-87 is a converted B-24. Before this bombardment group can go on 1 combat flight, it must make 4 trips over the hump. To perform 1 extremely dangerous mission, those crews must make 4 separate flights over the most hazardous mountain terrain in the world. Until such time as we conquer the territory and build the road into China, and/or capture a seaport, we must follow this procedure whether it is for 40 aircraft or 4,000.

Our problem of making supplies flow into China by no means starts in Assam. When Maj. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton and his men first arrived in India from Java they found a total of 10 airdromes in that entire subcontinent. Until that time, the British defense of India had been based on the assumption that the only threat could come from the northwest frontier—the Kyber Pass. The Japanese seizure of Burma suddenly threatened attack not from the northwest but the east.

A complete and rapid readjustment of defenses was in order, a formidable task in any country—let alone India. There, the enervating heat, the apathy of the

natives, the total absence of modern methods and equipment, combined to form a staggering prospect.

Assam is separated from the rest of India by the Brahmaputra, one of the longest rivers in the world, and one that has not a single bridge through its length in that country. Its mean level varies with the seasons. At certain times of the year, a 25-foot rise and fall puts river ports out of commission during both flood and ebb periods.

There is no through road between Assam and Calcutta. Rail transportation is complicated by changes in gage, and the existence of antiquated train ferries. The capacity of the inland water system was for a long time even lower than usual because power units and barges had been moved to Iraq. And during the monsoon season, nearly all nonriver transportation ceases because the area is completely flooded.

The monsoon season lasts, in Assam, from mid-May to mid-November. The average rainfall is about 150 inches as compared to a 20-inch average for a similar period in, say, Virginia. Malaria is a constant threat.

Life and labor are cheap in India. Sections of tea land were cleared for our airdromes and runways were painfully built with rocks taken from the river bottom and carried in baskets on the heads of coolies. Antediluvian stone rollers, pushed by other coolies, are used to pack down the rock.

Our flying transport operations are no less difficult. The pilots who fly our transports in that weather are as exposed as any in actual combat. Seventeen thousand-foot mountains have to be cleared by instrument flying; if our men veer to the north they meet 22,000-foot peaks while to the south they drift over Japanese-held Burma. It is no country to crash-land in.

That is the route our supplies must travel after they have already been shipped more than 10,000 miles—supplies not only for our Fourteenth Air Force but to help equip the Chinese Army and to build and defend China's airdromes.

And yet the Fourteenth Air Force is in the skies over China. Under the command of a master tactician, Gen. Claire L. Chennault, American fliers of the Fourteenth have from February 2, 1942, to October 31, 1943, brought down 351 Japanese aircraft, with a loss to themselves of only 68, an unrivalled record. That is not counting enemy aircraft probably destroyed or damaged.

A record of this scope is all the more impressive in that it was built up in the course of what is, by today's standards, aerial guerrilla warfare. The pre-condition of all successful guerrilla operations—an actively friendly countryside—exists in China, and the Fourteenth has taken advantage of this by helping the Chinese create one of the most efficient aircraft warning systems in existence. Our bases are notified of the approach of a Japanese flight almost at the moment it takes to the air. This warning system was one of the factors that enabled the Fourteenth to provide the

support which helped to stop the Japanese cold in the Tungting Lake offensive of May and June 1943.

In its primary mission of protecting the terminal bases of air transport, the Fourteenth Air Force has been completely successful. At the same time, we know that air transport must be established for our Chinese bases. It need hardly be stated that we have no intention of allowing our air operations from the Asiatic mainland to remain on the level of guerrilla warfare. Neither Japanese shipping nor Japanese industry will survive the bombing in store for them.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, my able colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The remarks of the gentleman about China and the Orient should be of interest and should carry weight because the gentleman is familiar from personal knowledge he has had by reason of residence, as I understand it, in China. For how many years did the gentleman live there?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Just 3 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. But the gentleman knows the conditions over there, and I think the House is interested in hearing upon that question for the reasons stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

If China is, because of circumstances, forced out of this war we will live to rue the day that such a happening occurred. The only way that we can keep China in this war and fighting as she has over the last 7 years is to see to it that she gets the tools, because we can be very certain that if we keep her supplied she will do her job, and do it well.

The present method of acquiring lend-lease material for China is not too satisfactory. The material sent in is not the property of China but rather is American goods, and is at the disposition of the Joint Munitions Board. This Board may at any time change the destination of these shipments. China does not have a representative on this Board, the reason being, I believe, that China is not one of the producing nations and is therefore not entitled to a seat. Her needs are stated by an American Army officer specifically assigned to this particular job. All matériel destined for China is shipped to the commanding officer in India, who is General Stilwell, on a month-to-month assignment. This perhaps is necessary, but the objection to it is that this war cannot be waged on a month-to-month basis. Furthermore, the exigencies of other fronts sometimes divert supplies originally intended for China. China would prefer to have the United States make no promises except those which we can carry out. We have been overenthusiastic too many times and promised to China matériel which we could not under any circumstances, in view of our own needs, send to her. The result has been

that China has suffered one let-down after another, and this is not very conducive, as you can well understand, to a feeling of harmony and strength. China's thanks would be much more warm and sincere if we would promise a small degree of help and produce it rather than promise much and produce only a small part. China would like to have 60 divisions, or 600,000 men fully equipped so that they could be in a position to carry out a real offensive against Japan. At the present time the Chinese have only 3 or 4 divisions fully equipped, and they are located in India and on the Burma front. In China not even 1 division is equipped with American matériel.

While we have been doing remarkably well under lend-lease I feel that we should be able to do a great deal more. Certainly American ingenuity is not to be satisfied with an aerial route over the hump of the Himalayas into China and a proposed road through northern Burma. We know, of course, on the basis of what Admiral Nimitz and General Stilwell have both said that we are going to drive across the Pacific until we acquire control of a seaport on the China coast, but that is going to take a long time and until that day is at hand it appears that we will have to be satisfied with what routes we now have either in operation or under consideration.

In 1942 we sent over the hump something like 5,500 tons of supplies into China; in 1943 we sent in 12 times that amount and in the month of December alone we transported into China by air more than twice as much as we sent in during the entire year 1942. This indicates a great advance in the amount sent in but it by no means comes anywhere near satisfying the requirements of either Chennault and his Fourteenth Air Force or the forces of the Chungking government. However, in all honesty it must be admitted that this aerial transport route is probably the toughest road in the world. The average round trips between Assam, the starting point, and Kunming, Chennault's headquarters, were 5,000 a month which indicates, of course, that a great deal of traffic was being carried on. However, in northwest India the precipitation is the heaviest in the world and because of this plus extremely cloudy conditions and the mountain barriers which have to be flown over, the job is a tremendously difficult one. At the present time of the something in excess of 100,000 American troops in India 20,000 are being used in the building of the Ledo Road which is progressing favorably and which will, if the Japanese are stopped in Manipur and driven out of India, connect with the Burma Road eventually.

This road is being built by American troops and guarded by Indian-trained, American-equipped Chinese soldiers under Brigadier General Boatner. They are doing a splendid job and the Chinese troops have been able to furnish all the necessary protection. When the Ledo Road connects with the Burma Road, and that should not take too long, it will mean that the Japanese will have to be driven from the Burma Road area which

they occupy in northern Burma up to the China frontier itself. This is going to take a long time and added to that is the fact that the Burma Road itself will have to be repaired to a considerable extent, and when one considers the chasms which must be bridged and the other topographical difficulties to be encountered, one can begin to comprehend the seriousness of the situation. It is along the China end of the Burma Road that Chiang Kai-shek has some three or four divisions of American-trained troops, and to get back to what I said earlier in this talk, it is to this particular part of Burma and China that, supposedly, some of Japan's Kwantung Army soldiers have been dispatched.

I believe that the Lend-Lease Administration is doing everything in its power to speed up aid to China but I am far from satisfied with the actual tonnage which has been sent to our gallant ally. We are not fighting this war alone nor are we fighting to make the world safe for democracy. We are in effect fighting for the right of democracy to live, and whoever fights our enemies fights with us at the moment, and we are not under any circumstances obligated to accept what they think or believe. We have to realize that this is a global struggle and that it will take the united efforts of all those allied with us to bring this war to a victorious conclusion. To say that we have now entered on the most critical years we have ever known is simply to state the obvious. We cannot afford to let differences of opinion sway us at a time like this. We have an obligation to keep faith here just as do the men on the battlefields all over the world. The men on Wake, Tarawa, and Bataan kept that faith to the end. It is up to us, all of us, to finish the job they started. But valor alone will not win in this modern warfare of dive bombers and tanks. The final result will be determined by the united, organized, civilian army which supplies the uniformed armies with the shoes, planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, food, clothing, and medicine—everything possible for victory.

We cannot afford the type of mental or military unpreparedness which has characterized the Indian and Burma military strategy too often in this war. We have underestimated many things such as the striking power of the Japanese Army, the reaction of colonial peoples, and the defensive strength and dogged determination of the Chinese. Psychologically we have waged a very poor war and we seem not to have learned too much as a result of what we have been through. We have to realize that this is a life and death struggle and that, unfortunately, our losses are going to be great. That is the sad part about any war because while you can re-create wealth you cannot bring back a life.

I am interested in bringing an end to these barbaric struggles which plague each of our generations and I would like to save as many lives as we possibly can in this present war. That is why, I repeat, I am so interested in China and the part it should play. China is more than willing to assume her share of the burden

of carrying on the war in the Far East. She knows her limitations but she desires to work as a team—the Chinese to use their manpower to carry on the infantry operations if we will give them the supplies and the material, and we to use our ingenuity and skills to carry on the sea and air warfare. Our whole war plan in the Pacific is based on the belief that China will continue to oppose Japan indefinitely, but China—near the brink of exhaustion—cannot continue this policy unless we get the supplies to her. It is therefore obvious that we must take every conceivable step and use every power at our command to strengthen China's Army and to keep China in the war. Not only must we do it for selfish reasons at the present time but also because in a long range consideration of the matter a strong China will have the good will of the peoples of Asia and by that token we will have their good will also. China could lead the way to democracy in Asia. China could use her growing influence morally as well as politically to help build up a better order in the Pacific and, finally, China could make an important contribution to the enforcement of peace in the Pacific because with her great resources, both natural and human, as well as her geographical position, a strong China would be able to share with other great powers the responsibility of keeping the peace in the Pacific region and making that area one of security rather than the powder keg it is at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Gladly.

Mr. JUDD. I want to pay tribute to the very scholarly and sound statement made by the gentleman from Montana in regard to the situation in the Far East. I am very sure that America, naturally preoccupied with the coming invasion of Europe, is not paying adequate attention to the seriousness of the situation in the Far East.

Admiral King last summer said that our job would be made almost impossibly difficult if China were to drop out of the war. The way in which the white man has crumpled up like a house of cards and been caught unawares again, and again, and again in South China, South Asia, in Burma and India, is most disconcerting from the Chinese standpoint; yes, but primarily from our standpoint, because for every Chinese they lose we have to put in an American who, under these difficult circumstances, is not the equal of a Chinese soldier. I want to express my great appreciation to the gentleman for bringing this subject before us at this time when it is of such crucial importance to our own conduct in the war.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. As this House knows, I have a high regard for the gentleman and consider him one of the outstanding authorities on the Far East in the entire country. As I have stated on many previous occasions, we are indeed fortunate to have him here as a Member of this body.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD; and at the appropriate time, when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to insert articles V, VI, and VII of the master agreement, and sections of the original act of 1941, to show the necessity, I feel, for the amendment which I am going to propose tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman, however, asks now for permission to extend her own remarks?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A great deal of interest has been expressed concerning my amendment, and a great deal of approval, and in order that the Members may have it before them at this point in the RECORD so that they can refer to the master agreement with Russia, which is a sample agreement of the master agreements with other countries—and that master agreement will be found on page 72 of the report of the Seventy-eighth Congress on lend-lease operations.

The following is the section of the Lend-Lease Act to which I refer, and articles V, VI, and VII of the lend-lease report of the Seventy-eighth Congress:

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

(c) After June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses before June 30, 1943, which declares that the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer necessary to promote the defense of the United States, neither the President nor the head of any department or agency shall exercise any of the powers conferred by or pursuant to subsection (a); except that until July 1, 1946, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1943, or before the passage of such concurrent resolution, whichever is the earlier.

ARTICLE V

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred under this Agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost or consumed and as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or of the Western Hemisphere or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

ARTICLE VI

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics full cognizance shall be taken of all property, services, information, facilities, or other benefits or considerations

provided by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics subsequent to March 11, 1941, and accepted or acknowledged by the President on behalf of the United States of America.

ARTICLE VII

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded Governments.

I shall read my amendment:

Page 2, after line 11, insert the following: "Sec. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of March 11, 1941, as amended, is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(b)' and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Nothing in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into any final settlement with respect to the disposition, other than the return to the United States, of defense articles in the possession of any government of any foreign country and not necessary to the defense of such foreign country until the terms and conditions of such settlement shall have been submitted to the Congress and approved by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In listening to the reading of the amendment which the gentlewoman proposes I notice it refers to a particular subsection; that nothing in that subsection shall be construed as giving the President authority to make any settlement without the approval of Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is the subsection that gives him authority to leave in a country, if he wishes, or transfer, if he wishes, stock piles of defense articles from one country to another and allow that country to transmit goods or sell it or do anything else with it.

Mr. CASE. It is clear then as to the meaning of this amendment that it would prevent the President from incurring any agreement under any power anywhere in the lend-lease program without the approval of Congress, pertaining to the final settlement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman doubtless knows that the Committee on Foreign Affairs accepted the following amendment which reads as follows:

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word "satisfactory" and inserting the following: "": *Provided, however*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President in any final settlement to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic or post-war military policy except in accordance with established constitutional procedure."

That amendment affects settlement of our post-war economic and post-war military policies.

My amendment refers to the final settlement insofar as defense supplies are concerned. There are very large stock piles of airplanes, tanks, and other materials of war in certain countries. I believe there are ships. We want to make sure that those countries at some time or another are not going to use those materials of war against us or against some other country that we feel should be protected not only for its own sake but for our own protection.

Mr. CASE. I think the purpose of the amendment is distinctly good. I just wanted to be sure that the reference there to the particular subsection did not limit it to a portion of the final agreements instead of to any power the President might have with respect to final agreements.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that is the part that gives the President the authority. The President now has the authority to bring back the goods or leave them in the countries where they now are. I think that is a very dangerous thing. Nobody knows what is going to happen after this war is over. This Nation stood by among other nations and watched Germany arm and arm and arm and arm.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the amendment the gentlewoman is now discussing the amendment with reference to disposing of surplus lend-lease property?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is with reference to surplus lend-lease property after the war is over, and it may not be after the war is over. It might be that one country would make a separate peace. Certainly then this would serve as a great protection to the United States.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This is the same amendment discussed yesterday?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The same amendment discussed yesterday, although I have gone into the wording of

the amendment today. Yesterday I did not give the exact words.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is the gentlewoman going to put in the RECORD the amendment as she proposes to offer it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have just read it, and I am going to ask that the printed copy of the amendment go into the RECORD. I think it would be a great protection. I said yesterday that plenty of veterans who are now fighting, who are now in the service of our country, have been very much interested in a provision of this sort. They are suffering today because of lack of foresight on the part of the Government. They want to take no chances after this World War.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. On yesterday I interrogated the distinguished chairman of the committee as to how much had already been spent under lease-lend, and I understood him to say \$22,000,000,000. I have since been informed by another member of the committee that it is \$27,000,000,000. A difference of \$5,000,000,000 these days is not much. Can the gentlewoman give us some definite information as to that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to get that definite information. I do not have it here at the desk at the moment. I think the definite information so far as possible should be given to the House. I shall try to have what is available inserted in my speech.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I correctly understand the gentlewoman to say she has been trying to get the information and could not get it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I said it was difficult for Members of Congress to get it.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentlewoman certainly knows that the amount of money that has been appropriated for lend-lease is \$24,000,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not have the figures before me. I shall ask to have them inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. BLOOM. They are available in the office of the Committee on Appropriations. I think the gentlewoman would find if she investigated that the amount of money that has been spent and allocated up to the present time under lend-lease is \$22,000,000,000. In reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota, I do not see how more can be expended than was appropriated, because I think there is a law against that; in fact, I know there is. So the amount of money that has been appropriated up to the present time, and which I put in the RECORD yesterday, is \$24,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. The laws limiting any action of this administration are

more honored in the breach than in the observance. Of course the gentleman knows that.

Mr. BLOOM. Only \$24,000,000,000 is appropriated under lend-lease. Twenty-two billion dollars has been spent and allocated up to the present time, according to the records. I hope the gentleman

from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will take that statement as being correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The following is a table which appears on page 197 of the lend-lease regarding authorizations and transfers authorized from other appropriations.

Lend-lease appropriations

(Millions of dollars)

| Category | Amounts appropriated | | | | | Adjusted appropriations Dec. 31, 1943 | Percent change in appropriations ¹ |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | First appropriation | Second appropriation | Third appropriation | Fourth appropriation | Total | | |
| 1. Ordnance and ordnance stores..... | 1,343 | 1,190 | ----- | ----- | 2,533 | 1,692 | -33.2 |
| 2. Aircraft and aeronautical material..... | 2,054 | 685 | ----- | ----- | 2,739 | 2,680 | -2.2 |
| 3. Tanks and other vehicles..... | 362 | 285 | 129 | ----- | 776 | 739 | -15.6 |
| 4. Vessels and watercraft..... | 629 | 850 | 734 | 1,553 | 3,766 | 3,872 | +2.8 |
| 5. Miscellaneous military equipment..... | 260 | 155 | ----- | ----- | 415 | 354 | -14.7 |
| 6. Production facilities in United States..... | 752 | 375 | 112 | ----- | 1,239 | 1,105 | -10.8 |
| 7. Agricultural and industrial commodities..... | 1,350 | 1,875 | 3,267 | 4,452 | 11,244 | 12,600 | +12.1 |
| 8. Servicing, repair of ships, etc..... | 260 | 175 | 108 | 259 | 802 | 791 | -6.1 |
| 9. Services and expenses..... | 40 | 285 | 675 | ----- | 1,000 | 800 | -20.0 |
| 10. Administrative expenses..... | 10 | 10 | ----- | 9 | 29 | 29 | 0 |
| Total..... | 7,000 | 5,985 | 5,425 | 6,273 | 24,683 | 24,671 | -.06 |

¹ The Lend-Lease Appropriation Acts provide that with the exception of the appropriation for administrative expenses, up to 10 percent of the consolidated appropriation for any category may be transferred by the President to the consolidated appropriation for any other category, but no consolidated appropriation may be increased by more than 10 percent. The Fourth Lend-Lease Appropriation Act provided an exception in the case of ordnance and ordnance stores; certain transfers could be made from that category to agricultural and industrial commodities.

AMOUNTS OF LEND-LEASE AID AUTHORIZED

The amount of lend-lease aid that may be provided under the various acts is summarized as follows:

I

Lend-lease appropriations to the President

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| First lend-lease appropriation..... | \$7,000,000,000 |
| Second lend-lease appropriation..... | 5,985,000,000 |
| Third lend-lease appropriation (fifth supplemental, 1942)..... | 5,425,000,000 |
| Fourth lend-lease appropriation..... | 6,273,629,000 |
| Total..... | 24,683,629,000 |

II

Transfers authorized from other appropriations

Direct appropriations have been made to the War and Navy Departments and to the Maritime Commission for the procurement of items which are in the main common to the uses of our own armed forces and those of our allies. These items when produced can be used, in other words, by our own armed forces or those of our allies in the manner in which they can be most effective in defeating our common enemies. It is not until they are ready for distribution that they are allocated by the military experts in accordance with the strategic needs. The appropriation acts in question authorize transfers to our allies up to stated amounts under the Lend-Lease Act. That does not mean that transfers up to the stated amounts have to or will necessarily be made. All that it means is that there is sufficient flexibility for the military experts to assign the supplies where they will do the most good in winning the war.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| War Department, third supplemental, 1942..... | \$2,000,000,000 |
| War Department, fourth supplemental, 1942..... | 4,000,000,000 |
| War Department, fifth supplemental, 1942..... | 11,250,000,000 |
| War Department, sixth supplemental, 1942..... | 2,220,000,000 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| War Department, Military Appropriation Act, 1943..... | 12,700,000,000 |
| Navy Department, second supplemental, 1943..... | 3,000,000,000 |
| Departments other than War, third supplemental, 1942..... | 800,000,000 |
| Total..... | 35,970,000,000 |

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a great deal of confusion about this whole question of lend-lease and what it has done and what it is proposed to do.

On yesterday I interrogated several speakers, among them the chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I understood the chairman to say in reply to a question of mine that only \$22,000,000,000—I should not say “only,” because \$22,000,000,000 is a lot of money—has been released under the operation of the lease-lend law. I do not know why we call it lease-lend, because we shall never see any of it again. We are neither lending or leasing, we are giving it.

The point raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] on yesterday as to whether there would be a danger of our associate nations charging us rent for storage of this property after the war is over evoked some smiles on the majority side, but it would not surprise me in the least if some of our associate nations would present us with a bill for storage after the war is over.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman if he has ever heard anything from this administration or from any part of it that would indicate that these people would ever be called upon to reimburse us even in part for the expenditures we are now making?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think they have been assured that they do not need to pay us back, that "Uncle Sam" does not expect them to pay us back. Of course, this war is costing us anywhere from 25 to 40 percent more than it should. I want to read to the House a little extract taken from an address delivered by Dr. George Mecklenburg at the Wesley Church in Minneapolis on Sunday, March 19. This appears in the Wesley News. I may say that Dr. Mecklenburg enjoys a splendid reputation in our part of the country. He is one of our outstanding clergymen. He was rather strong for intervention, as I recall. I think he castigated me several years ago because I was not so feverish to get into this war, which, of course, is merely a continuation of World War No. 1.

Let me read what Dr. Mecklenburg, who just returned from a trip to Latin America, said:

Coming down through southern Mexico on the Vera Cruz-Tapachula Railroad, I got an earful about American extravagance. They told me that the United States was spending \$200,000,000 on that railroad, and it is a Mexican railroad belonging to the Government. Mexico has plenty of money to repair her own railroads now, yet we are down there doing it for them. Senator HUGH BUTLER, after traveling 20,000 miles through Latin America, comes home and attacks our good-neighbor policy. He says, "We have appropriated \$6,000,000,000 for Latin America, to be spent in 3 years."

I recall that statement very well. It was challenged by the New Deal proponents, but before Senator BUTLER got through with them he convinced the country that he knew what he was talking about, and he furnished us with audited figures to show that what he said was true.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I might say to the gentleman that when Senator BUTLER finally employed a firm of very eminent accountants and had gone over the figures he found that the 3-year program that he had spoken about called for an expenditure of \$8,000,000,000 instead of \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not surprised.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, please?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman mean to say that the amount of money that he just mentioned as being expended in other parts of the world is being expended under lend-lease, or is it an entirely different thing that the gentleman is speaking of?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am talking about American money being expended in other countries.

Mr. BLOOM. But the gentleman will admit this is not lend-lease money he is talking about?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is American money. It is money that is wrung from the taxpayers. It is money squeezed from the pockets of our people.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows it is not lend-lease money.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not a part of the economy program that the President promised the American people back in 1932.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly, if the gentleman from New York is through.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] that only a small part of it is a part of lend-lease, but nevertheless it shows the length to which this administration will go in wartime in the reckless waste and squandering of public money in every corner of the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, lend-lease is not the only tap on the Federal Treasury. We are showering American gold all over the world. In one locality we use the lend-lease nozzle. In another locality we use the good-neighbor nozzle. But the nozzles are going all the time and it is not to be wondered at that Uncle Sam is now taking 33 1/3 percent of every dollar we earn for Federal taxes, which does not take into consideration the taxes of the other political subdivisions.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. The gentleman seems to be somewhat at a loss as to the actual amount of money available under lend-lease and the amount that has been expended.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think I am any more at a loss than some of the members of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Let me read to you now from the hearings, from a schedule supplied in those hearings, on page 197. The actual amount, according to the schedule supplied by the Lend Lease Administration as of January 31, allocated in the sum of \$22,247,335,000. The amount of lease-lend aid authorized and set up in this schedule by direct appropriation amounts to \$24,683,629,000. By transfers from other appropriations \$35,970,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do I understand that there have been transfers to lend-lease of funds totaling \$35,000,000,000 from other funds?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. They are the authorizations for transfers from the War Department and Navy Department funds, aggregating \$35,970,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Most amazing.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. That is nothing new. That is what I put in the Record yesterday. The figures are correct and there is no secret about it. It has been open to the committee and it is open to the world, so there is nothing secret about it.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I am not indicating it has been a secret. I am merely giving the figures to the gentleman who seems to have made some inquiries about them.

Mr. BLOOM. I put them in the Record yesterday.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Then in addition to that, I might say there is approximately \$2,000,000,000 that has been transferred from the Maritime Commission, making a total of something like \$63,000,000,000 available under lend-lease for mutual aid or whatever term is used to describe it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would say lend-lease funds seem to have a very high velocity.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think the gentleman has taken care of the situation very nicely, so I will withhold any further remarks I have at this time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to read a little further, if I may. Dr. Mecklenburg goes on and quotes Senator BUTLER as follows:

He says that we have appropriated \$6,000,000,000 for Latin America to be spent in 3 years. He goes into details about it. He speaks of a sanitation project in Guatemala City which will cost us \$750,000 and the Guatemalan Government only \$19,000. He speaks of a road-building project for unemployment in San Salvador to give employment to 2,000 men. I know in the Senate investigating committee this project was denied, but I talked to the man who had charge of it. He was an American. He told me that Senator BUTLER told the truth. Senator BUTLER says that we are spending one-half a million dollars in Honduras, while the state only puts in \$7,360 to match it. Two hundred health centers financed and projected by America are under way in Latin America now. This may be fine missionary work and if we agree to do it it must be all right. But certainly we Americans knew nothing about it.

He is talking about us Americans here at home.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that good will is being built up in South America?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I think we could build up just as much good will if we set up 500 Christmas trees strategically placed.

Mr. BREHM. Last summer in my home town, Dr. O. B. Foster, an authority on Latin American affairs, told a local audience that our neighbors to the south still distrust us despite the New-Deal generosity with John Q. Public's money.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I will come to that in just a few minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me get this little gem in, Mr. Chairman, if you please, and then I will be glad to yield.

Dr. Mecklenburg goes on as follows:

I was told in Guatemala when we built the military camp there we started to pay such high prices for everything that President Ubico had to step in and put a ceiling on wages and prices so as not to demoralize the finances of the republic.

They do not say anything about demoralizing the morale of the people, but that would follow, of course.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] for whom I have a very high regard.

Mr. ELOM. I thank the gentleman very much. It is mutual. Speaking about the highways in San Salvador, that is the Pan-American Highway that was voted upon by this Congress. I think the gentleman voted for it years ago. That is where that money is being expended. It has nothing to do with lend-lease.

Mr. KNUTSON. I still come back to the old theme that it is American money.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, yes; but the Congress appropriated it.

Mr. KNUTSON. And whether it is loaned out—not loaned out—that is a misnomer—whether it is given out by lend-lease or the Federal Highway Department or someone else, the taxpayer suffers just as much agony when the money is being extracted from him.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Concerning this overburdened taxpayer, would the gentleman care to comment upon whether or not this overburdened taxpayer has more money left after paying taxes today, say 1944, or even in 1943, than he had after paying taxes in 1932, a year that the gentleman remembers very well?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; of course. Yes; he has much more money because he cannot buy much of anything now.

Mr. McMURRAY. Oh! That is why?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. He cannot get gasoline; he cannot get sugar; he cannot buy a double-breasted suit of clothes with a vest and cuffs on the trousers; he cannot get tires unless he is related to the reigning family. Oh, yes. He should have more money because there is no place to spend it. At least when the Republicans were in power we could find a place to spend our money.

Mr. McMURRAY. But does he not have more income?

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course he has more income, because there is no place for him to spend his income.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not a little unfair to base income—

Mr. KNUTSON. I am so glad the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] is having such a good laugh. It sounds like it comes from a vacuum.

Mr. BREHM. I think it is unfair to attempt to take the national income and say that we get that income raised by blood and sweat and tears. It took a war to get that income raised.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course.

Mr. BREHM. I would rather have no income and have peace.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; up to the time of this war you gentlemen have heard me say through the years that there was only one way Roosevelt would solve the depression and that was through a war. That is the only way he could get rid of unemployment in this country.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Possibly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] is not aware of the fact that our national debt today is approximately 10 times what it was in 1932.

Mr. KNUTSON. Very true. Now, laugh that off.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] does not take into account the fact that if the taxpayer has more money now he has a national individual debt of some several thousand dollars, according to the number in his family. That was touched on by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak]. But the observation I would like to make is this, and it is in line with what the gentleman is speaking about: We have no yardstick by which we can judge the value of a billion dollars. You can say it as easily as a million, but we have lend-lease now, according to the gentleman from West Virginia, something like \$67,000,000,000. It is easy to say that, but that is equal to twice the value of all the real estate in the United States today.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true, and there is a priority on everything but Government bonds.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. On this point about the debt, remember that every dollar of public debt also represents in the pockets of certain American people, that much assets. We are no worse off, as a total economy, because we have that debt, because the debt is property in the vaults of your own banks and of your own accounts, and if you cancel the public debt completely—do not misunderstand me on this—if you cancel that public debt completely you would not increase the wealth or decrease the wealth of the United States of America one cent. You would merely redistribute the wealth.

Mr. KNUTSON. How about the people?

Mr. McMURRAY. Some people would gain and some would lose. You take the money out of one pocket and put it into another pocket, but the two pockets are in different pairs of pants.

Mr. KNUTSON. I know the President says our national debt is not a debt because we owe it to ourselves.

Mr. McMURRAY. I did not say it was not a debt. I said it was a debt owed by all of the people to some of the people.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is giving utterance to a very interesting, if not new, philosophy of economics. It is

the kind one would expect to come out of the University of Chicago.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman cannot find an economist in the country that will disagree with what I have said.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] should bear in mind that when a nation loses its self-respect, it is indeed a poor nation. That is what can happen by going on and on and on with the debt.

Mr. McMURRAY. But the gentleman never suggested that we lose our self-respect or that we do not pay our debts. Do not read into my remarks something I did not say. I was merely trying to explain the economic basis of this.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] misunderstood the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]. What the gentleman from Wisconsin said is that if the Government were to repudiate its bonded indebtedness, nobody would lose anything.

Mr. McMURRAY. No. The gentleman did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. If I can understand the English language, that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will you please say what you did say.

Mr. McMURRAY. I will say it, and I will say it so simply that it will be understood even on this floor.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. I am very simple-minded.

Mr. McMURRAY. I said that if this debt were repudiated—let us assume the debt is \$300,000,000,000—if the debt is repudiated, all the American people would gain \$300,000,000,000, all of them put together, and some of them would lose the \$300,000,000,000, which is represented by the bonds they now own.

Mr. KNUTSON. I get you. It is a bookkeeping transaction.

Mr. McMURRAY. All right. Put it this way. There would be as much gain to all of the people as there would be loss to the specific holders of the bonds.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. That was my point. If America repudiates her debt we have lost our self-respect and we are indeed a poor nation.

Mr. McMURRAY. But I did not suggest repudiation.

Mr. CURTIS. But you said it would not hurt us.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I got the impression that no one would be hurt if we repudiate our debt.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not want to give that impression. Some people would get hurt badly.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is a mind reader.

Mr. McMURRAY. No. I said—let me repeat—I said it would not increase or

decrease the national wealth by one penny, and that is an economic truth.

Mr. KNUTSON. Therefore, no one would be injured.

Mr. McMURRAY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. What I would like to know is what is happening to the material wealth of the Nation, all the vital materials that we are disposing of, in the transaction the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KNUTSON. You had better take a trip with lend-lease and find out what is becoming of our material wealth.

But I want to read further. I will not take much more time. I surely appreciate the gentlemen's indulgence.

Now, let us get back to Dr. Mecklenburg's remarks. He says:

What the South American hates about this lend-lease business, giving them \$2,000,000,000 a year, is just that. It makes America the giver and Latin America the receiver. It puts them in a lower class, and they hate it. They like our money. They receive it, and much of this money is doing good, but all the same, they hate it. It is impossible to make friends by lend-lease.

That brings me back to the theory, may I say to my good friend from Wisconsin who has been an ardent advocate of the good-will policy, that I think we could accomplish more for an infinitesimal fraction of what it is costing us if we were to install Christmas trees at strategic points over Latin America, strung with popcorn and other delectable things that used to appeal to our childhood hearts. You remember how thankful we used to be on Christmas morning when we could take an apple off the Christmas tree instead of having to bob for it in a bucket of water.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does not the gentleman seriously, in his attack on lend-lease—

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not attacking; I am merely taking the cover off to see what makes it smell.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does the gentleman believe we would have been better off if we had not sent 8,000 airplanes to Russia to be flown against the Germans on the Russian front? Does the gentleman think we should have kept those 8,000 airplanes home?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think we would have been much better off if we had sent 2,000 of them over to Bataan and Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Please do not interrupt this delightful colloquy.

Mr. BLOOM. I do so because I regret to say I do not enjoy the comedy; lend-lease is too serious.

Mr. KNUTSON. I admit it is serious to those who are in this fight; it is also very serious to us who are paying for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, for I have no desire to

trespass on the good will or the time of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman made a statement with reference to South America. I stated yesterday, and I want to say it again—and I want to have the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota—I should like to state, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Committee and for the RECORD, especially for the benefit of the gentleman who just relinquished the floor, that the amount of money expended in South America under lend-lease was \$127,000,000. During 1941, 1942, and up to the present time, however, South America has bought from the United States \$2,300,000,000 worth of merchandise.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very unfair to try to place our friendly neighbors to the south in the position with reference to lend-lease that the gentleman from Minnesota just did, to emphasize what they are getting from us, when they have bought \$2,300,000,000 of goods from us. They have received under lend-lease \$127,000,000. I want the RECORD to show the situation with reference to our neighbors to the south.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the debate during the past few minutes has been very illuminating. I happen to have the information relative to our expenditures in South America. I believe the greater part of the lend-lease money that has been expended down there has been for airfields which are helpful to us in the war effort. Is that correct? I ask the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know; I have not the figures at hand, but I agree with a great deal of what the gentleman has said. Much of this money was spent in Panama, I believe. That does not show in this picture because it comes under the heading of protection of the Panama Canal. Most of the airfields were built in the jungles of Panama.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I do not believe the expenditure of money to which we refer contemplates any of the airfields built within the Panama Canal Zone. I believe all of the airfields that have been built outside of the Canal Zone have been included in the hundred-and-some million dollars from the lend-lease fund, the gentleman mentioned. I believe it is a perfectly proper expenditure. No one can question the expenditure of any part of the lend-lease fund that goes for an actual and direct help in the war in which we are now engaged; and certainly no one can change the fact that the building of airfields in South and Central America has been help of that type. So far as that is concerned, I am in complete agreement. But I do want to say that the expendi-

ture of a sum of nearly eight billions of dollars in a 3-year program of W. P. A. projects out of funds entirely removed from lend-lease or war activities in South and Central America or even to attempt to spend this additional amount at a time when we are called upon to spend such vast sums for war purposes is unconscionable and something the people of this country ought not to tolerate. Such spending at a time like this, such planning, it seems to me, can be the product of nothing less than disordered minds.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], I should like to call his attention to page 8 of the committee report, where he will find a full explanation with reference to lend-lease aid extended in South America. He will find it very enlightening. I shall read one paragraph from it. I should like to read all, but time does not permit. I hope the gentleman will read the balance of it himself, for I believe if he will do so he will get the information he is seeking:

Substantially all lend-lease shipments to the other American republics have been military equipment such as tanks, guns, airplanes, and small naval vessels. In addition, small amounts of essential equipment and materials have been shipped for the production of munitions. The lend-lease program for the American republics is designed to strengthen the Western Hemisphere defenses, and the schedule of munitions to be supplied to the American republics was approved by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Secretary of State.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there are other explanations in the report with reference to South America that I know he will find very enlightening and interesting.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to my friend from New York that I shall be pleased to read the report. On the other hand, however, does the gentleman claim that all of our expenditures in Central and South America have been approved by our Chief of Staff?

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman refer to lend-lease or to all expenditures?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I refer to all the expenditures to be made by this administration in the Central and South American republics during the current 3-year program.

Mr. BLOOM. For military purposes, yes. There are other things that we are doing down there; we are helping to build the Pan-American Highway and other things; but all things of a military nature that come under lend-lease, let me say to the gentleman, have been approved by the military authorities.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Let me say to the gentleman that I approve every penny of expenditure of lend-lease funds that goes for actual help toward the war effort.

Mr. BLOOM. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman has brought up the question of military equipment supplied to the Central and South American republics. I cannot see how that will be very helpful to us in this war, and I am not sure that the Chief of Staff has approved every one of those items.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the Record. I suppose permission to include letters, telegrams, and so forth, including a couple of letters from Drew Pearson, I would have to obtain in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will have to get that permission in the House. If the gentleman wishes to extend his own remarks on this bill at this point he may ask for such consent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I did not extend my remarks, I suppose I could read those letters, could I not?

The CHAIRMAN. If time were yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, he could read them with the consent of the Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Chair mean I would actually have to read them?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman propound a unanimous-consent request to extend his own remarks at this point in the Record?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I obtained permission before the House went into the Committee of the Whole to revise and extend my own remarks and to include certain telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles. Could those come in at this point, or will I have to make that request again?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair is only Chairman of this Committee, but the Chair believes the gentleman has permission if he obtained it in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To put them at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, can I raise a question of personal privilege in the Committee of the Whole, or do I have to wait until we go back into the House?

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAGNUSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4254, to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include part of a report of the commanding general of the Army Air Forces pertaining to the Far East to immediately follow the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Flathead Monitor of Thursday, June 10, 1943, concerning the proposed Hungry Horse Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein articles V, VI, and VII of the master agreement with Russia, which is a sample agreement made with all the other countries under lend-lease; also certain paragraphs of the original Lend-Lease Act; also certain material from the hearings on lend-lease which gives the amount of money which has been expended for lend-lease and that has been transferred from other departments to lend-lease, and if I can get the record, I want to include information regarding the amount of supplies, not in dollars and cents, that have been transferred from other departments to lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] just obtained unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the Record. I notice in looking at them there on the desk of the official reporters there are some charges against other Members of this body. Is there any way now that I can object or must I wait until tomorrow and ask to have them stricken?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already received permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is the ruling, and I understand it is a correct ruling, we will have to ask that everyone submit their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Any Member has the privilege of objecting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will test that ruling now. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein certain telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. That is in accordance with the rules of the House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a radio address I made on April 2, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a speech made by the Honorable I. H. Hull, of Indianapolis, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein excerpts from a speech delivered by the Governor of South Dakota, Mr. M. Q. Sharpe, on the subject I Am Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, during the recess the Honorable Charles Burke, a

former Member of this body passed away. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at a later date in order that I may pay proper tribute to the memory of Mr. Burke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes this afternoon at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may proceed for 5 minutes, revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein newspaper articles, letters, and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I noticed in a Mississippi paper where the city marshal in one of the towns of my district was indicted, charged with depriving Negroes of their civil liberties. This newspaper article did not give any of the facts in the case. I do not know whether that indictment was written in Washington and sent down but do know that others have been. I served 8½ years as district attorney of the district in which that city lies and know that the law-enforcement officers certainly have a hard job enforcing the law in cities having a Negro section, particularly on Saturdays and Sundays. In their efforts to keep the streets safe and to maintain order these officers have had and must have the support of the right-thinking citizenship. Such indictments as this only make their job harder. This marshal enjoys a splendid reputation, was fair and courteous in his treatment of persons he had to deal with in the discharge of his duties. I have full confidence in the Court seeing that only justice is done.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that such indictments are being returned at the insistence of the Justice Department here in Washington in the hope that some Federal judge will be required to sustain a demurrer to an indictment and thereby a test case can be brought to the Supreme Court that Mr. Frankfurter may have another opportunity to write some more, in my opinion, un-American law.

Mr. Speaker, we remember when in our section it was unsafe for a lady to walk the streets after dark as I understand it

is in some sections of Washington today. We don't expect to see that day return in Mississippi. The C. I. O., and other organizations, which I understand are sponsored by it, may use all the force against me and other Members of Congress they may desire. We expect to continue the fight.

This is national campaign year. Many say the drive of the Justice Department here to indict individual officers and the South generally is for the purpose of securing Negro votes in the coming national election. If that be the purpose, I say that politics are being carried too far. Those determining such a policy are making a mistake. This method is the one sure way, if carried far enough, to be sure that the Democrats of the South will push from their bosom those who call themselves Democrats but who all the while are trying to destroy the South, which has nurtured the Democratic Party through the years.

Mr. Speaker, during this war these labor unions have collected tribute from men who desired to work for this Nation's war effort; not regular members of such unions but citizens who had to join, pay dues and initiation fees, in order to work for their Government in the time of its greatest peril. Money so collected has amounted to millions of dollars, has increased the debt of the Nation, by increasing the cost of war and will have to be paid, largely by the servicemen returning. There can be no excuse. These labor unions have forced American citizens to pay dues and belong to their unions before they could have the right to work and, Mr. Speaker, this they have done while preaching freedom. These organizations have collected millions and now they use them in an effort to control the Congress by opposing all Members who have the views which I entertain and for which I have fought. They hope to elect men in our place who will bow to their dictation.

I supported the Smith amendment of 1942 which would to a large extent have corrected this situation and which died in the other body. I supported and spoke for the Smith-Connally bill to control strikes passed over the President's veto. Unfortunately many of its most worth-while provisions were taken out over the strongest opposition we were able to muster. At that time a letter came to my office that if I supported that measure, I and all others who supported it could expect the C. I. O. to use all means at its disposal to insure our defeat. Mr. Speaker, I told this group then to crack its whip, that I would vote for such control so long as I remained a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at length against the bill to repeal the poll tax in the Southern States. Here again we find the un-American leaders of organized labor urging the passage of an unconstitutional act to strike at the South and again threatening each of us from that arena who had the courage to oppose them.

I supported the Hobbs bill, which would prevent virtual highway robbery in the

name of a labor union right. This bill passed the House only to be tied up in the Senate. In recent months we have seen the situation grow worse. We have seen a Supreme Court not interpret the law, but write the law as they believed it should be—and with Justice Frankfurter and others of his type determining what it should be, we are seeing serious inroads being made in the very foundations of our Nation. This Court has held that no longer can a party determine its own membership.

Mr. Speaker, we in the South do not intend to take this move of leaders of organized labor lying down. We expect to continue to run the Southland for the best interests of all its citizens. We frankly believe in white supremacy and expect to see that it is maintained in our area. Too well are the dark days of reconstruction remembered.

Mr. Speaker, at this hour the Nation and particularly my beloved South stands in the gravest peril not only from without but from within that has faced us since the dark days of reconstruction.

Those waging this fight for our destruction from within seem to care not that we in the South have and are supporting the war to the greatest extent of any section. During the little more than 2 years I have been in Congress I have seen the organized effort of the C. I. O. and of other labor organizations in their desire to increase the Negro membership in their organizations so that they could collect more dues, wage a fight on the South. These great sums of money, for which they did not have to account until recently, through their political action committee they expect to use and today are using in an organized effort to gain further control of the Nation by defeating those Members of Congress who have the same views I have and who have waged a fight to rid the Nation of their strikes, their right to a check-off of dues and their other un-American activities.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in high positions who have agitated this situation and made it worse. The Congress of Industrial Organizations by using the tremendous sums at its disposal, by reason of its privileges given to it by laws passed before I became a Member of this body has done more than any other group to destroy the real America. These activities are certainly not conducive to unity and have in many instances seriously retarded the war. Now it appears that this labor union has not only the backing of agencies of Government, having had a favorable Supreme Court on construction of labor laws, but now have the support of that Court in striking for so-called social equality, and the destruction of every man's right to choose his own company.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard to be of real help to the Nation. I feel that I can claim some credit for having called attention to the illegality of the Elk Hills-Standard Oil contract which resulted in the contract being canceled.

Some time ago I was able to increase the penalty for charging commission to secure Government contracts from 8

months in jail to 5 years in the penitentiary. This racket was broken up.

Recently I feel that I contributed greatly to the new policy whereby the Army cut loose its right of reentry on air fields and other facilities which it no longer needed thereby enabling the Navy to make use of them. In all our minds, first and foremost, we must win the war. Just as certain there are some other things which will bear of no compromise: the safety of our womanhood, the individual right of a man to select his own associates, the right of a State to run its own affairs in a truly constitutional way—all are of more import to us in the South than anything short of the necessity of winning the war.

Certain party leaders might take time to realize these facts before the die is cast and the South is forced to protect these rights through its own ingenuity and actions.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to continue to oppose with all the force I possess the attempt to destroy the State governments and the efforts of these forces in our Nation to stir up trouble for us in the South, the only place where the two races have resided in harmony. Segregation of the two races has proven to be the only basis for harmony. We expect to keep that segregation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter written by the Citizens' Public Celebrations Association of Boston for Patriot's Day, which includes the towns of Arlington, Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Concord, Lexington, Medford, and Somerville, this letter being signed by E. B. Mero, secretary, and also to include a description of the significance and scope of Patriot's Day, also a resolution that I introduced on April 19, 1943, House Joint Resolution 117, which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriot's Day for the commemoration of the event that took place on April 19, 1775.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have offered a resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

Exactly 169 years ago the people of the district I have the honor to now represent and the people of America decided that they would fight, they decided that if necessary they would lay down their lives and fight in order that this country might have liberty and freedom of action.

At this time, when the boys and men of the United States are fighting to preserve this freedom, it is appropriate to

remember the patriots of those early days, 1775, who laid down their lives for the same thing. It is important to keep before us constantly the sacrifices made by the men of those early times and to think on Patriots' Day of the men in the present war who are giving their lives, of men who are giving perhaps more than their lives, giving their health and their strength and parts of their body—living examples of the sacrifice they made in order that their country might survive.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago this country was the beginning of the Nation that we now have and love today.

CITIZENS' PUBLIC CELEBRATIONS ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON, April 18, 1944.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: This association, because of its basic purposes stated briefly on this letterhead, is naturally interested in House Joint Resolution 117 that you introduced some months ago seeking to have the 19th of April of each year proclaimed as Patriots' Day.

We are interested because of its relation to historical events in this section of the country, but we also are interested because of the national significance of this date in the unfolding story of the establishment and development of this Republic of the United States of America.

The 19th of April has had particular attention in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for many years, and Patriots' Day was designated thus by act of the general court, chapter 22 of 1933, calling for an annual proclamation by the Governor and specifying that the observance is to commemorate "the opening events of the War of the Revolution and the struggles through which the Nation passed in the early days."

It is not merely an occasion for commemorating that famous and picturesque midnight ride of Paul Revere, nor the accompanying ride of William Dawes, nor of the part played by a third and often overlooked rider, Dr. Samuel Prescott.

Patriots' Day is set apart in Massachusetts, and also by the State of Maine, to pay tribute to all the men, women, and influences that led up to those man-to-man fighting acts at Lexington, at Concord Bridge, at Arlington, and by the men of the other towns who thus began an 8-year war for independence of country and people that other men of 1944 at this moment are at war to preserve.

There is a further and less known significance to this date.

When the armed conflict that followed the preceding years of preparation for freedom and independence had resulted in victory, the Commander in Chief, Gen. George Washington, purposely selected the 19th of April as the date of the Peace Proclamation which was formally and officially read to the troops assembled for the purpose at Newburgh, New York State, on the 19th of April 1783.

Thus this date marks both the beginning and the ending of one of the world's great historic events.

May we suggest that favorable action to advance the proposed legislation may be timely? Such action now could be of morale value in the present war that is being carried on to insure that what was gained for the people and the Government of this Republic by the determined efforts of our forefathers, and for the people and the governments of other lands that are inspired thereby, shall not be diminished but shall continue to be a beacon of liberty.

A jointly arranged observance of Patriots' Day is in progress in eight cities and towns

of eastern Massachusetts. Appended to the advance public announcement is the following statement which might be enlarged to apply to a wider observance of this and similar anniversaries:

"In Massachusetts we remember now the determination, planning, struggles, and sacrifices of the colonial patriots of 169 years ago.

"We observe Patriots' Day 1944 as inspiration toward victory to insure perpetuation of the privileges of freedom and liberty that we have inherited."

By request of the committee.

Very truly,

E. B. MERO, Secretary.

SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPE OF PATRIOTS' DAY

Each year the 19th of April, an anniversary date of national meaning and with important historical significance, is observed as a Massachusetts holiday with an official proclamation by the Governor of the Commonwealth calling for a renewal of familiarity with—to quote from the act of the General Court establishing this fixed observance—"the opening events of the War of the Revolution and the struggles through which the Nation passed in the early days."

Patriots' Day focuses attention on the advance planning and organization for defense and offense that made possible the victorious conflict of the 19th of April in 1775 that involved one way and another the combined activities of the men and women of the eight cities and towns which jointly observe the anniversary with particular reason.

The annual picturesque reenactment of the famous rides of the 3 messengers who spread the alarm by direction of the watchful committee of safety of that time, organized and prepared for such an emergency action—this is an item in the current celebrations that attracts much interest, locally and outside—even nationally. The long-time prearranged efforts that focused into stern action here on that date 169 years ago made world history. Then it was war. Again in 1944 it is war, this time for the perpetuation of those valued items by which the Minute Men, the Sons of Liberty, and the Patriots generally throughout this and the other Colonies were determined to do their utmost to have freedom and liberty established with independence of government. Victory came from their determination, actions, and sacrifices.

Some of the yet far-off aspects of World War No. 2 can be better understood by realizing that it was right here in these eight communities in colonial days that almost parallel situations and stirring episodes were taking place, not all as much publicized and as popularly interesting as the "midnight ride" of either of the ordinary, everyday individuals whose contribution of that 18th and 19th of April long ago are made the focusing point of the 1944 Patriots' Day observances.

HISTORY IS AND SHOULD BE A GUIDE TO PRESENT AND FUTURE ACTION

What our predecessors did here years ago was due in a marked degree to the same inspiration that impels the war activities of men, women, and groups of citizens today. They wore different clothes and had different facilities for everyday living and for work and such pleasure as was possible, but the basic ideals and aims were not much different on the part of the patriotic ones then from the same things today.

When Paul Revere's impersonator goes riding along, or the modern William Dawes, or Samuel Prescott, they are not just theatrical figures out of imagination. They represent realities, and their appearance must inspire realism, not alone for young people but for parents and all adults.

And not merely for the enlightenment or temporary interest of this small eastern area

of the United States. The lessons and verdict that came out of the risky adventure of 169 years ago are at this minute up for confirmation or for destruction. This year's observance of this anniversary of the small skirmishes that struck the spark that lit the fire that inflamed a nation and a world is certainly not just a holiday of frivolity, spring outing, and fun. The element of recreation, of course, belongs with the observance, and festivities of various types are included in the day's programs. The point is that while this is so, the basic importance of this Patriots' Day as already outlined needs to have attention, too.

Patriots' Day in Massachusetts took the place of the older Fast Day in 1894. The present plan of observance was produced by the Citizens' Public Celebrations Association of Boston, which has supervised the annual arrangements. Each of the cities and towns immediately concerned has its own local committee designated by mayor or selectmen to arrange and conduct local ceremonies. The association is the coordinating agency.

The first reenactment of the Revere Ride under this plan was in 1916. The first similar Dawes Ride was in 1920. Since 1930 a Prescott has ridden from Lexington Green to Concord Battlefield.

Paul Revere was an experienced messenger, and a businessman of prominence, used by the Colonial officials for various confidential missions, of which his 18th and 19th of April journey was the one that became most known. His other services and experiences were important, and are duly recorded.

William Dawes, Jr., was a young tanner, less well known, but also a trusted agent; and his services that night of 1775 were of equal importance. As recorded by Revere in his own record, each was sent from Boston by a different route; a precaution of the committee of safety against failure of their plans.

Boston was then under siege and no one supposed to leave the town without permission, especially as the enemy troops were moving that night in what they hoped was complete secrecy.

Dawes went in disguise of a miller and got by the sentry posted at Boston Neck on his way to Roxbury, presumably walking, and took horse at that point. He apparently proceeded without undue incident until he got to Lexington.

Revere walked from his home in the North End, got his instructions, was rowed across to Charlestown, and there took horse. At about the same time the enemy was departing for the same destination from Boston Common, but their scouts were already abroad—as Revere found out when one group of Red Coats almost captured him before he got out of Charlestown.

After both riders had performed their missions by giving the alarm to previously designated leaders along the way, they arrived at Lexington. Leaving for Concord both were intercepted. Revere was captured and while prisoner improved the opportunity to watch the later happenings, which he recorded.

Dr. Samuel Prescott, on his way home from a late evening, or early morning, social call, met them, got the news, escaped from the enemy scouts and he carried the word to Concord.

House Joint Resolution 117

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, formed

the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation arose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue his proclamation, annually, emphasizing the significance of the events that occurred on April 19, 1775, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all public buildings on April 19, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the patriots who laid down their lives for the cause of independence.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 506), as follows:

Resolved, That THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Elections No. 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 507), as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Indian Affairs, Flood Control, Roads, World War Veterans' Legislation, Claims.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SMEARERS ARE DESPERATE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, however worthy the purpose, if any one of the individuals who have been indicted as seditionists is connected in even the remotest degree with the movement, PM and those pursuing a similar policy attempt to hold up to public scorn everyone whose name may be mentioned in the same connection.

A recent illustration is the attitude of PM, when Protestant Chaplains Association wrote a letter, asking that a resolution be introduced proclaiming a day of prayer for the American Republic, for the guidance of American patriots in the Halls of Congress and for those who are now in the armed services both here and abroad. One of those letters came to me. It was as follows:

PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION.

New York, N. Y., March 25, 1944.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: The Protestant Chaplains Association, a national organization of Protestant clergymen, founded in 1938 and dedicated to God and country, to the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces of these United States and to the rehabilitation of our veterans upon their return to civilian life—is asking that you cooperate with them and with the Protestant churches of the country in proclaiming a day of prayer for the American Republic and for the guidance of those sterling American patriots in the Halls of Congress who for some years past have been the victims of a highly organized campaign of ridicule, slander, and abuse by certain elements within this Commonwealth who have no love for America, the Constitution, or its institutions.

This campaign is being conducted throughout the Nation through the medium of the Protestant churches for a day of prayer on Sunday, May 21, this year, and is something worthy of your support and that of every other public official who loves this Republic as we know you do. The Governor of your State is already cooperating with us in this direction.

The Governors of every State as well as the mayors of every city throughout the country, and every other prominent man and woman in religious and political life in the Nation have been petitioned to proclaim this day of prayer; and we are glad to report to you now that the response has been overwhelming, and is 100 percent in favor thereof.

Congressman HOFFMAN, we are going to ask you to prepare a resolution for introduction on the floor of Congress, setting aside Sunday, May 21 this year as a national day of prayer for the preservation of this Republic and for the men and women who have made the supreme sacrifice, and for those who have been maimed and wounded and are lying in our hospitals at home and abroad, and for the safety of those now fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

We have singled you out, Congressman HOFFMAN, for this high honor . . . because of the abuse and slander and vilification and lies that have been hurled at you by the subversive elements in our midst.

May I quote a statement issued to the press relative to the day of prayer, May 21, 1944, by Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut:

"Prayer is man's method for self-transmission of personal needs and beliefs to Almighty God. It gives strength to the weak and brings humility to the strong. Prayer is a denominator of good for all peoples in time of war. As the divine method for establishing relationship between man and his Creator it deserves special recognition in our religious life.

"I urge the people of Connecticut to make special observance of Sunday, May 21, as a day of prayer. In this holy way may we ask God's blessings upon our Nation and our people."

We shall be guided by your good judgment in preparing this resolution to be submitted to the Congress. And at your early convenience will you kindly send a copy of same to us for press release?

Believe us to be, with the best interests of our beloved country at heart, and for your continued good health in that you may serve it further, and the great State of Michigan which has so highly honored you, we are, for God, our homes and country.

Yours in the service of Christ,

Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,

Deputy Chief Chaplain.

I had no knowledge of the organization except as it was given on the letterhead, but immediately replied as follows:

MARCH 30, 1944.

DEAR CHAPLAIN: Many thanks for your kind letter of the 29th.

If you have the wording of the resolution referred to in mind—make a clear and concise one and send it on.

Respectfully yours.

In reply I received the following letter:

PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., March 31, 1944.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: In compliance with your request for a proposed resolution, please find enclosed copy of same, which you can add to or take from, according to the parliamentary rules, except for the fact that we would like to have our name incorporated in the act.

We are now asking the cooperation of the Roman Catholic hierarchy throughout the country, for we feel that we would be un-Christian and un-American if we did not ask them to participate with us in this most worthy cause.

We can now assure you that we are receiving 100-percent support from all over the country.

Please let us have a copy of the resolution or act which you present on the floor.

Thanking you for your kindness and cooperation, we are, for God, our homes, and country.

Yours in the service of Christ,
Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,
Deputy Chief Chaplain.

To which I made answer on April 3, as follows:

APRIL 3, 1944.

DEAR REVEREND LOWANDE: Replying to yours enclosing the resolution.

The resolution came in too late for introduction in the House before it recessed, but it will be presented in proper form as soon as the House meets again. I did, however, put it in the Appendix of the RECORD on Saturday.

Sincerely yours.

The resolution was printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A1692. In view of what followed it should be read.

Then, on April 12, to my surprise came the following wire:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., April 11, 1944.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Edward James Smythe, now awaiting trial for sedition, has organized with one Alexander Lowande a Protestant chaplain's association, whose letterhead bears your name as member of a committee sponsoring its campaign for a day of prayer. Please advise us whether you gave permission for such use, and if so whether you were aware of Smythe's record and connection with the organization when you did so.

GEORGE V. MCINTYRE,
Assistant Managing Editor the Newspaper PM.

To that wire, I replied at once as follows:

Neither Protestant Chaplains Association, any individual or organization was given authority to use my name. Do not know Smythe. Inserted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD April 1, resolution at request of Protestant Chaplains Association. Smythe's name does not appear on letter sent me. Do not know any individuals so named.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

I also, on the same day, wrote Rt. Rev. Alexander A. Lowande the following letter:

APRIL 12, 1944.

Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE,
Protestant Chaplains Association,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR REVEREND LOWANDE: Because I was advised this morning that my name had been used in connection with that of Edward James Smythe and this resolution, am not introducing it today.

Enclosed is copy of wire received from PM today. What is the answer?
Sincerely yours.

On the fourteenth he wired me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: Replying to your letter of April 12, please be advised that PM articles are based on fraud, falsehood, and misrepresentation characteristic of this newspaper. Two employees of this office have been identified as operatives of the so-called Nonsectarian Antinazi League, who stole papers from this office and turned them over to PM. The names of the employees are Edwin P. Banta, of 215 East Seventeenth Street, New York City; and Mrs. Florence Harris, of 8818 One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Street, Jamaica, Long Island. Banta was discharged last Saturday, and on the following Monday, last Monday, April 10, went to the printer and obtained several copies of the letterhead which contains the names of representative Americans who had been kind enough to write us commending the purpose of our enterprise, namely, the establishment of a Nation-wide day of prayer for the American Republic. These letterheads had not been delivered to our office and not a single one of them was sent out of this office. But Banta turned his copies over to PM who in turn wired to all the names that appeared on the letterhead for explanation without first inquiring of us, and thus presented the matter in false light. These letterheads would never have been used by us having been unsatisfactorily printed. This organization is sincere and patriotic in its work. It is no fund-raising racket as PM would maliciously describe it. We received \$2 to date and returned the same since we are not soliciting funds. Smythe was interested in our work but has voluntarily resigned. I knew nothing of his background, being concerned solely with the character of the enterprise and its high and noble aims. In America, of course, a man is presumed innocent until he is found guilty. Smythe will have his day in court, but I need not point out to you the purpose of the smear articles in PM. Personally, I have been engaged in religious work since 1895, and ordained in the ministry in 1903. I was consecrated as bishop of the United Christian Church November 18, 1934. I hope, my dear Congressman, that this will be a satisfactory answer to your inquiry and you are at liberty to give it the widest possible publication to the end that truth shall be triumphant, with assurance of my high regard. I am.

Rt. Rev. ALEXANDER A. LOWANDE.

PM, on April 14, said that 46 Representatives, 14 Senators, 14 Governors, and 6 mayors had been listed as sponsors of Protestant Chaplains Association and charged that it was about to conduct a fund-raising campaign. Some 6 Senators and 11 Representatives denied, as did I, that they had authorized the use of their names for any such purpose.

In my wire to PM, I also stated that I did not know Smythe. To refute that statement, PM then published a letter which it claims Smythe received from my office back in 1941, and which read as follows:

Friend Smythe: Thanks for yours of the 11th. Shall be glad to receive the information referred to therein.

If Smythe should walk into my office, I might recognize his face, for I may have seen him, but I would not connect that face with his name.

Many people write Congressmen letters, either enclosing or offering to send on information on topics in which they are interested. When such letters come to me, if they deal with a new subject and I or one of the clerks has the time, a reply is sent, telling the writer to send on whatever information he may have.

The letter quoted above and reprinted in PM was not dictated by me, but was sent on by one of the clerks, although, had the matter come to my personal attention, the procedure would have been the same.

The fact that Smythe was addressed as "Friend Smythe" meant no more than do the words of the President in his fireside chats, when he so frequently uses the term, "My friends."

Not from Smythe nor from any of his codefendants—no; not even from PM—but from a former investigator of a congressional committee came these purported copies of two letters alleged to have been written by Drew Pearson.

One is addressed to Smythe as "Dear Mr. Smythe." Note the following letter from Pearson to Smythe:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1937.

Mr. EDWARD J. SMYTHE,
National Committee Against Communism, New York City.

DEAR MR. SMYTHE: This is to acknowledge your letter of July 10. I appreciate your frankness and understand from the last paragraph of your letter that you are willing to have us use your statement that you are a Fascist organization, etc.

Very sincerely yours,
DREW PEARSON.

By the above, was Pearson leading Smythe to believe that he would cooperate with him?

And the next year, it is alleged, Pearson was writing Lt. Col. Pearson B. Brown as follows—Brown, according to my information was the vice president of the Protestant Chaplains Association:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1938.

Lt. Col. PEARSON B. BROWN,
New York City.

DEAR COLONEL BROWN: Thank you for your letter enclosing a copy of yours to John Hamilton.

I am wondering whether your organization has taken note of the tremendous Catholic lobby which was exercised in Washington during the discussion and vote on the reorganization bill. How did your organization stand on this bill?

Very sincerely yours,
DREW PEARSON.

In the latter letter, was Pearson attempting to get something to throw at a religious organization?

Was Pearson's letter to Brown a come-along letter? Brown is reported to have been the vice president of the Protestant Chaplains Association, of which Smythe was coorganizer.

Was Pearson attempting to incite that organization to enter into a controversy which might cause ill feeling between religious groups? Was he encouraging the Protestant Chaplains Association to start a fight with the Catholic Church

over some proposed legislation, the enactment of which was then before the Congress?

PM's viciousness, its unfairness, is illustrated by this incident, by its attempt to make it appear that all those who advocated a day of prayer for the preservation of the Republic, for the sick and wounded in hospitals here at home and abroad, for the speedy return of those in the armed forces, and for the souls of those who have made the supreme sacrifice, were in some way guilty of some improper association or connection with Smythe, who has been indicted for sedition, but who, under our law, is presumed to be innocent until convicted.

PM and its editors may not believe in prayer. I do. And I have no doubt that every one of the Senators and Representatives whose names were mentioned believes in a Deity, in the efficacy of prayer.

The Communists deny the existence of God. In some of their literature they proclaimed that religion was a fraud; that the priests and the ministers were hypocrites. There is no law which prohibits PM following the Communist lead.

It is regrettable, when so many Americans—fine young Americans—are dying in foreign lands for the preservation of our Government, for the Nation which places its trust in God, that any publication should condemn a resolution asking for a day of prayer.

It will be noted that the Right Reverend Alexander A. Lowande, in his wire to me, denied that the Protestant Chaplains' Association was engaged in any fund-raising campaign. But, even if it was, and if Smythe was as guilty as the devil himself, that is no reason why those of us who believe in prayer should be condemned because at some time Smythe may have been a member or even the founder of that organization. Some of us have not forgotten that a thief on the cross, by virtue of a prayer, had his sins forgiven and was promised a home in Paradise. Only by its attacks on decent folks does PM gain attention.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STARNES of Alabama for 15 days, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers; and

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) Wednesday, April 19, 1944, at 12 o'clock the House adjourned until tomorrow, noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Wednesday, April 19, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of S. 1767.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, April 20, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 3998, authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions; and H. R. 4517, to remove restrictions on establishing post-office branches and stations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1437. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, United States of America, transmitting a copy of the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1439. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Library.

1440. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3688. A bill to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1354); Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4823. A bill to authorize the use of space in the old Post Office Building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battle-ship Oregon, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the old Oregon country held by the State for public display; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4624. A bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4625. A bill to extend the existence of the Alaskan International Highway Commission for an additional 4 years; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4626. A bill to declare a portion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal an unnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4627. A bill to amend subdivision (e), of subsection (4), of section 3540 of chapter 33A, title 26, of the Internal Revenue Code, known as the Use Tax Stamp Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 4628. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the establishment of an interregional system of highways, and to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highway facilities in the locations where such facilities are most urgently required and where the conversion from wartime to peacetime activities will require the cushioning effects of public-works construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. Res. 504. Resolution to investigate the question of effective legal protection for property and proprietary rights and ownership in original thoughts, conceptions, and ideas in art, literature, science, mechanics, and the pure and useful arts; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 505. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 504; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Wolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Marvin Sachwitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of John L. MacNeil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Mose Lee Hogan and Mary Allen Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5503. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 3, West Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 118 residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furloughs for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5504. By Mr. JUDD: Petitions of 140 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.